

and white, have been moving from the rural areas into the big cities in all regions.

Question. What seems to be the No. 1 goal of the younger Negroes now? Is it political power or economic power?

Answer. I would say both. As Jimmy Brown said when he left the Cleveland football team, the other day, he is out now to do his best to help his people economically. The goal is both economic and political power. The two go together.

#### BOYCOTTS AND PICKETING

Question. How will the striving for economic power express itself? In boycotts? Consumer-union activity?

Answer. I would say it would express itself the way that I led the people of Harlem to break down the barriers as early as 1931—in boycotts and picket campaigns.

Also, it will express itself in the legislation which has already come out of my Committee, which, though not aimed solely at the black man, nevertheless helps him because the black man is a part of the suffering, poverty-stricken group of America. This includes the Manpower Development Training Act to train the unemployables; the war on poverty, which we all know about; the program of work-study in colleges where a young American, black or white, not on the basis of his ability alone but also on the basis of need, can now go to college and be paid while work-studying.

Then there's the apprenticeship-training program—which is not what it should be, and we hope to change it—but, in the meantime, under the Vocational Education Act, we do pay the drop-outs to go to school while they learn a trade—not one of the old trades of painting and carpentry, but the new trades like electronics and things like that.

Most important of all is stricter federal enforcement of laws barring discrimination in employment. Black people must get more jobs, and neither American industry nor the Federal Government is hiring black people in sufficient numbers. These are some of the things that are being tried.

Question. What about complaints you hear from Negro leaders that the poverty program has not affected the mass of Negroes—that they are not touched by these federal programs?

Answer. It is because of those complaints and the results of intensive studies by task forces from my Committee that we have made—in the new poverty-program legislation—44 changes which will help to correct those complaints and get the money down to the man on the street who needs it, and give him the hope for the future that he does not have now.

Question. How long will it take for these programs, to change materially the condition of what you have called the black masses?

Answer. I would say it would take longer than I hope, because time is running out. I would say we are not putting enough money into the programs. I have said this repeatedly.

Question. How much money will it take?

Answer. Michael Harrington, the brilliant young Catholic writer who authored the concept of the war on poverty, and Leon Keyserling, the economist, think it will take 12 billion dollars a year to do what is needed.

Question. Do you think that is enough?

Answer. I think it's minimal.

#### TEN HOT SUMMERS AHEAD

Question. What did you mean when you said, "Time is running out"?

Answer. If you've got this "new breed of cats" coming up, and you have a program that is going to take 10 years or longer, then that means you're going to have Watts and Harlem and Chicago for the next 10 summers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Labor Department has furnished me these facts, which are most alarming.

In June of 1965 the unemployment among white people in the United States was 4.1 per cent; the unemployment among black people in the United States was 8.3 per cent.

One year later, in June of 1966, the unemployment of whites had shrunk from 4.1 to 3.5 per cent. But the unemployment of blacks increased from 8.3 to 9 per cent.

Then consider this: In Harlem, 40 per cent of all the housing in my area is dilapidated and deteriorating, according to the statistics of the department of housing of New York City.

Now, we must realize what figures like this means.

Question. Is there any way the prospect of more trouble can be changed? Is there any hope of avoiding further rioting?

Answer. Not as long as we are engaged in the conflict in Vietnam.

Question. How does the war in Vietnam relate to this?

Answer. It relates to it because we don't have the money to fight an international war against Communism and a domestic war against poverty and racial discrimination at the same time.

### Standby Tax Authority for the President

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Saville R. Davis reports in the August 22 issue of the Christian Science Monitor that the President is expected to ask Congress for standby authority to raise and lower taxes within prescribed limits.

On July 25 I introduced legislation—H.R. 16486—to provide standby authority for the President to increase taxes up to

5 percent during the period after Congress adjourns this year. It is already apparent that the use of monetary policy alone may not be sufficient to halt the overheating of our economy. The President himself has warned that the upward pressure on prices and costs threatens to overheat the economy in the last half of the year and four members of the Federal Reserve Board have come out publicly for tax action to stem the threat of inflation.

A situation may well develop after Congress adjourns that can only be handled by the dampening effects on the economy of a tax boost.

That is why I am urging that the Congress provide standby tax increase authority for the President.

### Greater Kansas City Area Safety Council, Inc.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago when horses still outnumbered automobiles, a group of citizens banded together to form the Greater Kansas City Area Safety Council, Inc. Today that organization marks its golden anniversary—a half century of service to the people and community. The council, chartered by the National Safety Council is supported by memberships, business, industry, professional, labor, and civic groups. The first president of the organization, Julian H. Harvey, developed the "three E's" attack on accidents: engineering, enforcement, and education. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, as will our colleagues, that the slogan appeared on a recent U.S. postage stamp. Two years ago the Kansas City group was awarded the Flame of Life, the highest honor of the National Safety Council's board of trustees. Mr. Speaker, just as we here in this House last week went on record in the cause of safety, so has the Greater Kansas City Area Safety Council entered its second half century resolved to strengthen America by helping to keep its citizens alive and productive and to assist and support all Federal, State, and local efforts in this direction.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the abundance of Thy mercy another day is added to the

record of the lengthening years, as swift to its close ebbs out our little day. For the tomorrows and their needs we do not pray. For the day of Thy grace which now bathes us in its returning light, give us courage, give us vision, give us wisdom, that we fail not man nor Thee. Save us from being embittered by ingratitude, pettiness, or meanness, and from cowardly compromise in the global battle now raging for the minds of men. Valiantly may we fight the good fight whose issue will mold the future, knowing that

so soon the night cometh when no man can work. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., August 23, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, a Senator

from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. AIKEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 22, 1966, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, August 22, 1966, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar; and

H.R. 8760. An act to amend the provisions of Oil Pollution Act, 1961 (33 U.S.C. 1001-1015), to implement the provisions of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6143. An act to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act;

H.R. 8205. An act to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15706. An act to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases;

H.R. 16337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16340. An act to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person

officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 16863. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 6143. An act to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act;

H.R. 8205. An act to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes;

H.R. 15706. An act to amend section 5 of the act of February 11, 1929, to remove the dollar limit on the authority of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims of the District of Columbia in escheat cases;

H.R. 16337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16340. An act to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 16863. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1844, in order to clarify the corporate name of Georgetown University, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16940. An act to amend the provisions of the act of April 8, 1935, relating to the board of trustees of Trinity College of Washington, D.C.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3752. A bill for the relief of Caterina E. Kerenyi, Anna Eosze, and Laszlo Eosze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3753. A bill to amend chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the ground on insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appeared under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3754. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide a fixed allotment percentage for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3755. A bill for the relief of William Howes Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S NORTHEASTERN TRIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the last weekend, President Johnson traveled in the northeastern part of the United States. His journey took him to a meeting at Campobello with the Prime Minister of Canada and the dedication there of the Roosevelt International Park.

The President began his tour with visits to Buffalo, Syracuse, and Ellenville in New York State. In each of these places, Mr. Johnson looked and listened to the Americans who had gathered to greet him. In each of them, he spoke his thoughts and expressed his feelings on a range of public questions.

Mr. Johnson made four major statements in these three cities. Taken together, they contain a vivid documentation of certain domestic problems which have pressed strongly for attention during these years of his administration. The statements speak of the pollution and waste of the waters of the Great Lakes and other major resources. They refer to questions of urban crowding and the rent gouging of the poor. They allude to the overall health situation of the Nation—to the second-best standards which we maintain in some instances—and to inequities which still attend upon the availability of health care for American citizens.

The President put these and other domestic questions into a wise and temperate perspective. He sees them in the mitigating light of the Nation's dynamic progress. Mr. Johnson loves the United States and takes deep pride in its immense material achievements. Nevertheless, he is not so dazzled by these achievements as to be insensitive to large areas of esthetic and human neglect which have been questionable byproducts of rapid progress. It is with the latter that Mr. Johnson has concerned himself in these exceptional statements.

The President spoke from the heart of a great America which is destined to be-



come greater because it faces up to the ravages which have been visited upon the landscape and the humscape of the Nation. He depicted an America thoughtful rather than thoughtless of its great heritage of water and other natural resources and, above all, of its human resources.

His is a vision of an America whose countryside sings again and whose great cities are fully fit for satisfying human habitation. His is a determination that there shall be an America which not only sets the highest standards of health for its inhabitants but which also provides equity for all, in the professional medical care which is necessary for the realization of those standards.

These four statements reflect the President's sure grasp of some of our major domestic issues. They make clear that an effective and nonpartisan congressional response to his outstanding leadership has already begun to bring us to grips with these issues. And they are, finally, harbingers of some of the actions which should come, must come, and will come in order to insure an adequate Federal contribution to the human progress of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the four statements previously referred to be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SYRACUSE, N.Y.

I want to talk to you today about the center of our society—the American city.

Over 70% of our population live in urban areas. Half a century from now 320 million of our 400 million Americans will live in cities with our larger cities receiving the greatest impact of this growth.

For almost three years my administration has been concerned with the question: What do we want our cities to become?

For you and your children, the question is: What kind of place will Syracuse be fifty years from now?

A city must be more than a collection of shops and buildings; more than an assortment of goods and services; more than a place to escape from.

A city must be a community where our lives are enriched. It must be a place where every man can satisfy his highest aspiration. It must be an instrument to advance the hopes of all its citizens. That is what we want our cities to be. And that is what we have set out to make them.

One word can best describe the task we face—and that word is immense. Until this decade, one description fitted our response: "too little and too late." By 1975 we will need two million new homes a year—schools for 60 million children—health and welfare programs for 27 million people over the age of 60—and transportation facilities for the daily movement of 200 million people in more than 80 million automobiles.

In less than 40 years—between now and the end of this century—urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as has been built since the first settler arrived on these shores.

Our cities are struggling to meet this task. They increased their taxes by 39% between 1954 and 1963, and still their tax debts increased by 119 percent. Far more must be done if we are to solve the number one domestic problem of the United States.

Let me be clear about the heart of this problem: It is the people who live in our cities and the quality of the lives they lead that concern us.

We must not only build housing units; we must build neighborhoods. We must not only construct schools; we must educate our children. We must not only raise income; we must create beauty and end the pollution of our water and air. We must open new opportunities to all our people so that everyone, not just a fortunate few, can have access to decent homes and schools, to recreation and culture.

These are obligations that must be met not only by the Federal Government but by every Government—State and local—and by all the people of America. The Federal Government will meet its responsibility, but local government, private interests and individual citizens must provide energy, resources, talent, and toil for much of the task.

Many of the conditions we seek to change should never have come about. It is shameful that they should continue to exist. And none are more shameful than conditions which permit some people to line their pockets with the tattered dollars of the poor.

We must take the profit out of poverty. And that is what we intend to do.

First, I have asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set as his goal the establishment—in every ghetto of America—of a neighborhood center to service the people who live there.

Second, I have asked the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to increase the number of neighborhood legal centers in slums. I want these legal centers to make a major effort to help tenants secure their rights to safe and sanitary housing.

Third, I am directing the Attorney General to call a conference to develop new procedures to insure that the rights of tenants are fully and effectively enforced. We will have at that conference the best legal minds in the country to work with State and local officials.

Fourth, I will appoint a commission of distinguished Americans to make the first comprehensive review of codes, zoning, taxation, and development standards in more than two generations. I proposed the establishment of such a commission in my 1965 message on the cities. Both Houses of Congress this week agreed in conference to fund this effort. The work of the commission will begin immediately upon the enactment of this legislation.

These are steps we will take now. But let me be perfectly candid: This job cannot be done in Washington alone. Every housing official, every mayor and every governor must vigorously enforce their building, health, and safety codes to the limit of the law. Where there are loopholes, they must be closed. Where there are violations, the exploited tenant must be assured a swift and sure action by the courts.

Not even local officials, however, can change these conditions themselves. Unless private citizens become indignant at the treatment of their neighbors, unless individual citizens make justice for others a personal concern, poverty will profit those who exploit the poor.

The Federal government, of course, has a very large responsibility. And we are trying not only to fulfill but enlarge our role in the rebirth of American cities.

In 1961 we are investing \$15 billion in our cities. We have increased that nearly 100 percent—to almost \$30 billion. For the first three years of this decade these programs increased by an average of \$1½ billion per year. Since then, they have increased \$4 billion per year—2½ times the rate of increase in the previous three years.

We have made important new starts in many vital areas: in the War on Poverty; in assistance to law enforcement; in the attack

on pollution; in the training of manpower; in the education of children; and in the improvement of our health.

But not all the answers are in. Not even all the questions have been asked. We must continue to search and to probe, to experiment and to explore. We need constant study and new knowledge as we struggle to cure what plagues the American city.

This is why, for the first time in our history, our cities have a place in the Cabinet. More than a century after President Lincoln created the Department of Agriculture, we have a Department to serve the needs of the three out of four Americans who live in cities.

I have directed every member of my Cabinet who can help with our urban challenge to meet at least once a week in the White House—or as often as necessary, to keep our cities program moving. I have asked each one of them to go out into the cities and to see the needs for themselves—and to come back and tell me what he finds.

This is why we have brought to Washington the ablest men we could find in this country to concern themselves with the future of our cities. They have come from the universities, from business, and from labor. They are scientists, lawyers, and managers—creative men, men of vision, practical men.

This is why we have taken steps to set up summer programs for our youth, to keep the playgrounds open later at night, to open swimming pools and open fire hydrants on hot summer evenings. These temporary steps do not take an act of Congress. Any city can take them. Every city should take them now.

There are responsibilities, however, which only Congress can meet. We need laws and new programs—and we need them this session.

I have proposed to Congress what could become the most sweeping response ever made to our cities' needs. This is the Demonstration Cities Program which is still before the Congress. It admits for the first time that cities are not made of bricks but of men. When Congress acts—and action is needed now—we will be able to make the first concentrated attack on urban blight, and to rebuild or restore entire neighborhoods.

As we learn more, new ideas and new courses of action to improve our cities can be fitted into the demonstration cities program. It does not freeze our strategy and inhibit future change. It does not erode the power or local governments, but on the contrary gives cities new choice and new abilities, new ideas and new spurs to action.

Congress has already acted to provide the money for the rent supplement program that will mobilize private enterprise for our poor. Every \$600 of rent supplements will encourage private enterprise to build a housing unit with 20 times that amount.

Congress gave us \$18 million less than we need, and it only acted more than a year after we proposed rent supplements. But now we can move forward to help hundreds of thousands of poor families raise their children in clean and decent surroundings.

These are only two of the programs we have laid before Congress to help solve the problems of our cities. What we need now—and what American cities expect now—is action. Congress can pass this program and bring new opportunities to millions.

To the Congress I say:

Give us funds for the Teachers Corps—and let skilled teachers bring knowledge and a quest for learning to those children who need it most.

Give us more resources for rent supplements—and let us provide better homes for so many who live in substandard housing.

Give us the Civil Rights bill—and let us begin to break the chains that bind the



ghetto by banishing discrimination from the sale and rental of housing.

Give us the means to prosecute the War Against Poverty—and let us provide jobs and training for adults and a head-start for the very young.

Give us the Child Nutrition Act—and let us offer breakfasts and hot lunches to needy children who can be encouraged to stay in school.

Give us the Hospital Modernization bill—and we can build and modernize hospitals to serve our urban citizens.

Give us the legislation—and we can help overcome a severe shortage of trained medical personnel.

Give us the money for Urban Mass Transit—and our cities can begin to provide adequate transportation for their people.

Give us a just minimum wage—and more American workers will earn a decent income.

Give us better unemployment insurance—and men out of work can be trained for jobs that need workers.

Give us the Truth in Lending bill—so that customers, especially those who are poor, can know the honest cost of the money they borrow.

Give us the Truth in Packaging bill—so the hard-earned dollars of the poor—as well as of every American—can be protected against deception and false values.

We have an agenda for action. We have taken the first steps toward great cities for a great society. Now Congress must act to give us the power to move ahead on all these fronts.

This is no time to delay. This is no time to relax our efforts. We know there is no magic equation that will produce an instant solution to the blight and poverty and want deposited in our cities by decades of inaction and indifference.

But we also know there is no substitute for action.

I do not know how long it will take to rebuild our cities. I do know it must not—and will not—take forever. For my part, I pledge that this Administration will not cease our efforts to make right what has taken generations to make wrong.

We have started down that road. Until each city is a community where every member feels he belongs, until it is a place where each citizen feels safe on his streets, until it is a place where self-respect and dignity are the lot of each man—we will not rest.

This is what men have always dreamed their cities would be. And this is what we seek to build.

#### STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON ARRIVAL IN SYRACUSE

The pioneers who settle our country found a land blessed with magnificent forests, broad and fertile lands, and great rivers and lakes that provided abundant fresh water and highways for their travel and commerce. Their communities and cities grew beside these rivers and streams. Their pure waters supported growing populations and the establishment of industries to strengthen the sinew of our national prosperity.

But these natural resources proved destructible. The multitudes of our people, and the vast production of our industrial machine, are pouring an ever growing flood of waste products into our waters. Vast quantities of complex products from our technological society are polluting our streams and lakes, and, indeed, endangering our strength and our health.

Here in the Northeastern United States, where pure water in sparkling abundance was so long taken for granted, we have learned through harsh experience that those who would command tomorrow must not be idle today in the total development and maximum preservation of our resources.

For those resources, even though bountiful, are not inexhaustible. And they are peculiarly vulnerable to man's abuse.

Just last summer, when drought struck the Eastern Seaboard, millions of Americans learned for the first time what those in the arid West had long known—that water is life, and that its constant future availability can be no more certain than man's vision to foresee and his determination to forestall.

The Rivers and Harbors Omnibus Bill, which I approved October 27, contains as its very first provision the creation of a regional plan for anticipating and meeting the future water needs of vast metropolitan growth.

In taking this step, we have crossed a new threshold in national policy. We have recognized that the impoundment and movement of our waters, their maximum purification and development to power our industries, float our barges, quench the thirst of our growing cities and renew the earth from which our food is grown, must be undertaken as a coordinated whole.

No longer will piecemeal or half-way efforts suffice.

Last year, Congress enacted, and I signed into law, the Water Quality Act of 1965, to help us control and abate the pollution of our waterways.

In May, we consolidated and reorganized the Federal Government's water pollution activities under the Interior Department to make them more effective.

The House Committee on Public Works is meeting almost daily to consider a new and expanded Clean Rivers Bill, already approved by the Senate, to provide greater impetus and financial assistance for our war against pollution of our national waters.

Today, here in Syracuse, the House Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, has been sitting in hearings to consider new means of protecting the water quality of the Great Lakes.

In the United States, at least 20 billion gallons of water are wasted each day by pollution. This is water that could be used and reused, if treated properly. Today, it is ravaged water—a menace to the health. It flows uselessly past water-hungry communities to an indifferent sea.

Citizens of our largest city, in the midst of last summer's drought, could only look wistfully at the broad Hudson River as it rolled through their city. Clean and usable, it could have provided for all of their needs. But it could not be used, because it was too contaminated for human consumption.

This 20 billion gallon daily waste of water amounts to only about 6 percent of the nation's total water needs, when we consider the requirements of industry, irrigation and power. But it is an extremely significant 6 percent, since it constitutes better than one-fourth of the pure water needs of our country. Its loss adversely affects the lives, the economy, the health and the pleasure of far more than half of our population.

Here in the area of the Finger Lakes and in the drainage basin of our Great Lakes, you have seen the sad spectacle of these magnificent bodies of water beset with decay.

Lake Erie contains at its central core a 2,600 square mile area which can be described, for all practical purposes, as a "dead" body of water. It is so lacking in oxygen that marine life entering the area is doomed. It is a vast underwater "desert," and daily this contaminated area spreads.

Nor is Erie the only one of our Great Lakes beset with decay. It is merely the most advanced case. The water level in all five of them has dropped to the lowest point in recorded history.

Clearly, the time for action is at hand. The problems are made by man and can be

solved by enlightened man. They are in many ways a reflection of our fantastic growth, our very affluence, our way of life.

But we will not yield to carelessness or greed in our determination to preserve, unspoiled and unsullied for future generations of Americans, this natural inheritance which we received as our national birthright.

There is enough water falling annually upon our land to sustain us as a nation for all future time, if we are sufficiently able stewards of the treasure to form an intelligent partnership with Nature—to impound it, purify it, conserve it, move it to our areas of need, and thus make it serve our future.

We are determined to preserve our great national water resources. We shall not permit the growing spectre of drought, polluted waters, and blighted streams to rob us of our birthright. We shall develop our waterways, as we are doing on the St. Lawrence River. We shall harness the power of our rivers, as we are doing at the Dickey-Lincoln School Project. We shall clean up our polluted rivers and lakes. We shall preserve this national treasure for ourselves and for our children. Every one of us has this responsibility. With your cooperation, I know we shall succeed.

#### TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT NIAGARA SQUARE, BUFFALO, N.Y.

We are here today to take a look at a very important part of America.

We'll be in five states in the next three days, and before the leaves begin to turn brown we'll be in many more—looking and listening—and even talking from time to time.

I wish everyone could get the kind of look at the land that we will be getting in these three days—a look at people as well as places.

We are not here to look at an America without problems, but what we see here is not an America of only problems.

In a few minutes we will be on a Coast Guard cutter to see the pollution of Lake Erie. That's certainly a problem—a problem for the people of Cleveland and Toledo and Sandusky and Erie and, of course, Buffalo. It is a problem we are facing, but a problem that our states and cities must face, too, so this great inland sea will sparkle again.

Like so many of our problems, the pollution of Lake Erie is a result of our abundance. It has been caused by the great industrial might of Buffalo and Cleveland and Toledo and a dozen other cities. That industrial might has helped to create the kind of good life which so many people enjoy in Buffalo: the good homes that they own and cars and sailboats and powerboats, steel for schools and the economic abundance to pay schoolteachers, and the ability to use that same abundance to help improve our cities—and to help more Americans earn what many Americans already have.

For the first time we are attacking head-on the massive problems of water pollution in the United States.

In the last 2½ years some 300 local communities and even more industries have joined with the national government in a War on Pollution which is already improving the water used by more than 40 million Americans. We have started massive pollution programs in five of the Nation's river basins. These efforts are going to benefit directly seven out of every ten Americans.

The steady decline of Lake Erie is one pollution problem which I know has a special meaning to the people of Buffalo.

What happens to Lake Erie will alone affect the lives of more than 25 million people in the United States and Canada. Lake Erie must be saved. And, if we work together—the Federal Government, the State governments, the towns and cities and the local industries—we can save Lake Erie.



We are taking a first major step today in that campaign. The Department of the Interior is today giving the green light to the Rand Development Corporation for the construction, here on the shores of Lake Erie, of a new type of filter system. This system will at once prevent raw pollutants from entering your lake and will purify—at an economical cost—the water that does reach it.

This is the first construction contract awarded under the authority given to us by the Water Quality Act of 1965. It will be in effect on Lake Erie within a few weeks.

But that is not all.

The key ingredient in this experimental filter is pulverized coal that can be used as a clean fuel after serving as a filtration agent. If successful, this method of treatment would not only provide a solution to one of our most difficult water pollution problems. It would also afford a new use for coal that could run to hundreds of thousands of tons every year, as other plants become operative.

The Great Lakes constitute the largest body of fresh water on the surface of the earth. They have nurtured the growth of two great nations. Today, I am proud to say that we are well on our way toward restoring this precious international asset to a pure condition.

We can have the industrial might of Lake Erie and we can have a Lake Erie where people can swim and fish and sail. We can have both—and we should have both.

That's what is happening in America today, all over the country, in government and out; we're looking for both.

We are working for pure water and productive industry; for good earnings and leisure so that people can enjoy nature; and for conservation efforts so there will be nature to enjoy. We are looking for economic progress so people can afford automobiles, and for modern highways so they can travel without endless traffic jams.

All this is what we see in America today: a powerful drive to clean up the very problems our progress has created or overlooked. So much of American ugliness and impurity, so much of the contradictions of American life, are caused by just this: the eager and aggressive spirit by which we tamed this continent; so much so that at times and in places we've created a new dynamic beauty rising from the electric excitement of our built-up areas, and sometimes, sadly, we've just created blight and inequity and pollution.

These are the two sides of America that we expect to see on this trip.

We will certainly be looking at the problems, so many of which our own vigor has created, but we will know that this vigor has also created a society unmatched in human history.

We are going from Buffalo to Syracuse to meet the people of another great city. Later this evening we'll be in Ellenville to visit a new hospital in one of our most beautiful resort areas—an area built from scratch in mountainous farm country by nothing less than American vigor.

Tomorrow we'll be in Rhode Island at her fine university to talk to the students of the state founded by Roger Williams. Three hundred years ago he set forth some of the ground rules on which we have built: a separation of church and state, equality, freedom of conscience.

Early in the afternoon tomorrow we go to Vermont to inspect a water project and then on to New Hampshire and Maine.

Sunday morning we fly to Campobello to meet with the Prime Minister of Canada at the summer home of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On Sunday afternoon we will go back to Washington—back to the business of helping to keep America growing.

I am taking this trip not only to see New York and New England but because

it is every President's duty to tell the people about this program.

And in this case, duty is a pleasure.

For the program I want to talk about is a program that has touched the lives of millions of Americans.

Consider our aged.

The Psalms say, "Cast me not off in the time of old age." And we are taking that literally.

A few years ago, almost one in two older Americans had little or no financial protection against the high cost of illness. This was the greatest single threat to their economic security. But it also threatened the economic security of Americans who were faced with the harsh decision of paying for parents' hospital bills or a child's tuition.

The action we took to meet this problem was Medicare.

After more than thirty years of national debate, nineteen million older Americans have crossed the line from the shadows of uncertainty to the bright land of security. Medicare has brought basic coverage for hospital costs, home health services after hospitalization, outpatient diagnostic services, and skilled care in nursing homes.

Nine out of ten of our older people have also signed up for the voluntary medical insurance protection. They pay \$3 a month for this coverage and the Federal Government matches them dollar for dollar.

Consider our young.

Every year 100,000 bright young people could not go on to college after high school because they simply did not have the money. Others already in college dropped out for the same reason.

They lost, and so did the Nation. Each one of them gave up almost \$170,000 in the additional earnings they would have made as a college graduate. And the Nation lost not only millions of dollars in productivity but a very important asset: better educated citizens.

The action we took to meet this problem was the Higher Education Act of 1965.

More than 400,000 students in colleges and universities across the land have already received loans under this program. 200,000 students have been able to work part time because of work opportunities provided by this Act.

When classes open in September, two more new programs will take effect. Opportunity grants will help more than 135,000 needy students. More than half a million students will borrow more than \$600 million to help them in college.

Consider the children of our poor.

The cruel truth of education today is that too many underprivileged schools serve too many underprivileged children. Cultural and economic poverty erode the ability of many poor children to learn. And slow learners have little opportunity of catching up when their schools do not have special programs and special teachers.

This is why eleven times as many poor children are too old for their grade; why six times as many fail their elementary school subjects; and why one out of every three drops out of school in the fifth grade.

The action we took was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Seven million deprived children have been given intense courses in reading and writing. The handicapped and disturbed have gone to special classes. More than three million have had extra attention during summer months.

Consider also the poor who are sick.

Low income often means little medical care and little dental care—and too much illness. More than twice as many poor adults suffer serious chronic ailments as those who earn a good income. And twice as many poor children grow up with serious ear and eye defects as more fortunate chil-

dren. Half as many more poor children grow up crippled. And six out of ten children from low-income families have never gone to a dentist.

The action we took was the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Within less than a year more than a dozen states—including New York—have launched new medical programs for the poor. Twenty other states will follow by the end of this year. They will make it possible for more than eight million needy Americans to receive good medical service. Half of these will be children.

These are just some of the efforts we are making to solve some of the problems that afflict our nation.

They are why I am proud you responded two years ago when I came to Niagara Square and asked the people of Buffalo to help build a greater society.

You did help. You helped give us the most productive and creative Congress in the history of our country.

American history textbooks talk about the action Congresses of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. And they were action Congresses.

But let me tell you this about your lawmakers in Washington today: they have enacted more important legislation, and faced up to more national problems, and helped more people than any other five sessions of Congress combined.

What are the results? What is the impact?

In the last ten years, we have tripled our Federal assistance to State and local governments from \$4 billion to \$14 billion.

In the last three years our most essential programs—health, education, labor, welfare, housing, and community development—have risen by more than \$6 billion.

One year ago they were half of our total assistance to State and local governments.

This year they will be 65 percent.

And in three more years they will increase to 70 percent.

This must be only the beginning, for democracy's work is never finished.

Money and laws, of course, are not the final answer to democracy's needs. To pass a law is not to achieve a final result. To spend money is not to guarantee success. We will need more of each, but we must never forget that our most essential resource is invisible: it is our bond as citizens of the same nation and members of the same human family.

It is this bond that compels us to seek new ways of relieving our brother's plight. It is this bond that makes it impossible to quit the fight for an even greater America. For as long as one of our fellow citizens is in distress, as long as one member of our family is in need, we must persevere.

And this, I pledge you, we will do.

In New Hampshire tomorrow our plane will carry us not far from Franconia Notch where more than a hundred years ago Daniel Webster looked up at the rocky formation called The Old Man of the Mountain and said, "Up in the mountains of New Hampshire, God Almighty has hung out a sign that there He makes men."

He still does make men in America, and that's what America is really all about in the 1960's: to see if we have the people to match our problems—to see if we have the men to match our mountains.

I believe we do.

TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT ELLENVILLE HOSPITAL, ELLENVILLE, N.Y.

Standing in this place today, I almost want to echo the words which Moses heard from the burning bush: "Take off thy shoes, for this is holy ground."

For a place like this—a place of healing, where life is brought forth and health is restored—is truly sacred ground.



I see here not only a modern new facility—not only a temple to life and health. I see a monument to all the goals men can attain when they work together for the common good.

This hospital was built at a cost of more than a million dollars. It is the result of a partnership between local and Federal governments. More than one third of its construction money came from Hill-Burton hospital funds.

You and I can remember when this was not possible.

Twenty years ago, the Hill-Burton program was only a gleam in the eyes of a few men of vision. As always, there were doubters who said it couldn't be done.

The opponents claimed that the Hill-Burton program would stifle local initiative and choke private investment.

What really happened? What is the true story of those twenty years?

More than 350,000 beds have been added to our health facilities;

More than 8,000 facilities have been built to serve almost 4,000 communities; this one is number 6,635.

The Federal Government has contributed less than a third of the \$8 billion which has remade America's hospital map. Local sources put up the rest.

How many lives have been saved? How many bodies healed? We can never know.

The doubters expected problems. We gave them progress.

Last year, this Congress and this Administration declared, once and for all, that the time for Medicare is now; that from now on our older citizens should get hospital care—not as charity cases, but as insured patients.

The doubters rose up again. They forecast that if Medicare passed: medicine would be ruined, doctors regimented, and free enterprise wrecked.

What really happened? What is the true story of Medicare?

We worked day and night to launch this program.

Our planning took more man-hours than the planning of the Normandy invasion.

But despite all this, one critic put us on notice that July 1, the first day of Medicare, "a line of patients will stretch from Chicago to Kansas City."

One magazine predicted a "mammoth hospital traffic jam."

We organized a round-the-clock crisis center to receive the flood of complaints that were forecast and to deal with the coming national hospital emergency.

But nothing went wrong.

There was no crisis for the crisis center to meet.

In one month—not one call came in.

The men on that staff were the most underworked men in America.

We closed the crisis center.

We had a complete lack of complaints, but no lack of activity.

In sixty days, more than 500,000 Americans entered hospitals for treatment under Medicare.

In this first year, we expect that more than nine million hospital bills and 30 million doctor bills will be paid under Medicare's insurance programs.

More than six million children and needy adults have begun enjoying benefits under other portions of the same law.

The doubters predicted a scandal; we gave them a success story. They predicted emergency; we gave them efficiency.

Reaching millions of older citizens, persuading them to sign up for Medicare and choose voluntary benefits—this was a hard job. But we reached them—and today, almost 95 percent are enrolled.

Setting standards for Medicare; getting cooperation from hospitals across the land—this was a hard job. But today, 6,500 hospitals—with 97 percent of our general hospital

beds—are partners in Medicare. More than 2,000 health agencies are providing health service to the elderly in their own homes.

Where are the doubters now? Where are the prophets of crisis and catastrophe? Some of them are signing their applications; mailing in their Medicare cards. They want to share the success of this program.

There is another blessing which Medicare brings—one which touches every one of us.

It used to be, in many places, that a sick man whose skin was dark was not only a second-class citizen but a second-class patient. He went to the other door, to the other waiting room, even to the other hospital.

But today that old blot of racial discrimination in health is being erased. Under Medicare, the hospital has only one waiting room, only one standard for black and white. The day of second-class treatment and second-class patients is disappearing.

And that is a victory for us all.

These two acts—Hill-Burton and Medicare—are only two victories in America's health revolution. Five years ago, only one citizen in ten benefited from Federal health programs. Next year, one in five will be helped.

This is why I say we have reached a new day of good health for our people.

This is why I believe we are ready to practice what we have preached for so long: that good medical care is the right of every citizen.

A century ago we declared that public education was the right of every child. It was in the 19th century, not the twentieth, that Congress established the Land Grant College system and began to apply the benefits of higher education to the well-being of our people.

We have been a long time reaching the same point in health.

But finally, we are reaching it. And we intend to make up for lost time.

In the last three years I have signed 19 landmark laws in the field of health. Before this session ends, I plan—with the help of my friends in the New York delegation—to sign a few more.

The light from these great measures has just begun to shine.

In the yesterday that you and I remember, needy children waited helplessly for health care. They were at the end of the line. But in the new day of health, we are providing Comprehensive Care Centers to help them. These centers are already serving 1½ million children.

Yesterday, the mentally ill were placed behind the locked doors of asylums or locked in attics. But in the new day of health, we have community mental health centers—126 of them already underway—to bring treatment to mental patients near their homes.

Yesterday, retarded children had to be separated from their families to live in institutions. But in this new day, more and more retarded children live with their parents and brothers and sisters. Their nation has helped to provide special classes for them in the public school.

Yesterday, if a killer disease struck, too many families were too far away from the modern miracles of medicine which might save a loved one.

Today, in the new day of health care, we are developing regional programs to fight heart disease, cancer and stroke. They will move the miracles of the laboratory to the bedside quickly enough to save a life.

Yesterday, in the face of a growing population with too few doctors and dentists, we stood helplessly by. Today, federal programs have helped add a thousand medical students to the rolls, nearly five hundred dental students and nearly 2,000 nursing students. The need still mounts, but we are moving to meet the need.

In this new day of health, mental retardation clinics are serving 30,000 children. Crippled-children clinics are helping 450,000 children.

We have come a long way since the dark yesterday you and I remember.

In 1900, one baby in seven died in his first year. For Negroes, the toll was twice as high.

Today, only one baby in 40 dies before the age of one.

Early in this century, a newborn child had a life expectancy of less than 50 years—only 33 years if he were a Negro. Today, a child can expect to live 70 years or longer.

In the face of such progress, can we be satisfied?

Is the new day also the brightest day?

The answer is no.

With so much unfinished business in health, we cannot be satisfied.

When European countries are more successful than we are at keeping babies alive—America has a job to do.

When a Negro man lives seven years less than the average white man; when four times as many Negro mothers die in childbirth; when twice as many Negro babies die in their first year—America has a job to do.

When there are not enough doctors, not enough nurses, not enough hospital beds—America has a job to do.

We have proved that we can do that job if our visions are bold enough and our plans are big enough.

Ten years ago, we faced an urgent crisis of overcrowded mental hospitals. A national effort in research and treatment—led by our National Institutes of Mental Health—brought about a sharp reduction in the number of patients in mental hospitals.

Twelve years ago, 34,000 children and adults were struck down by polio. A national effort killed that killer—and the number of victims this year was almost zero.

Pneumonia, typhoid, dysentery, and cholera once stalked thousand of citizens into their graves. Today, because of a national effort, the threat of these diseases is drastically reduced.

Can we, in the next years of this century, match the record of the past?

Do we have the will and the vision?

I say we do. I say that the richest nation the world has ever known can demand no less.

So let us lay down a challenge to the future:

Let us declare that the American goal in the next decade is modern medical care for every person of every age, whatever his means.

We set as our goal for the next decade that the child born in America will have a normal life expectancy of 75 years—five years more than the child born this year; that the child born in America—no matter what color his skin—will have the same or better chance for life as the child born in Sweden, which has the lowest infant mortality rate in the world.

We set as our goal for the decade that the child born in America need no longer fear smallpox, measles, diphtheria, and whooping cough; that he will no longer suffer the heart damage caused by rheumatic fever; that he will no longer fear tuberculosis as a serious threat to health and happiness.

Our goal for America within this decade is to cut the kill rate from heart disease, cancer, and stroke by 300,000 men and women each year.

We cannot settle for less.

In fact, we ask for more: we want to find not only a longer, healthier life for every child and every citizen now living, we want also to find a happier life.

We will find it. Our children and their children will be stronger and live longer because of the work we do today.



I know we bear burdens at home and around the world. But I know also that no other age before this one has been so bright with promise.

And I believe that history, remembering these crowning years of the twentieth century, will say: "They did their job. They met their responsibilities. And by their work, they earned for themselves and their children a healthier, happier America."

Thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I made reference to the President's visit to a number of the Northeastern States of the United States and also his first trip to Campobello Island.

I had occasion at that time to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD four statements which the President of the United States delivered on his recent visit. These were addresses which he gave in New York State, at the outset of the journey. During the New York trip, the distinguished Senators from that State [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY] joined the President at Ellenville, N.Y., at which time the President dedicated a Hill-Burton hospital.

I had the distinct honor and privilege of traveling with the President and with many of the congressional delegations from those States on the continuation of his tour through New England. The entire delegation from Maine, the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE] and their Representatives [Mr. TUPPER and Mr. HATHAWAY], the entire delegation from Vermont, the dean of the Senate on the Republican side [Mr. AIKEN] and his junior colleague [Mr. PROUTY] and the Representative from the Granite State [Mr. STAFFORD], the distinguished Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL] and one of their Representatives [Mr. ST GERMAIN], the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] and one of the Representatives from that beautiful State [Mr. HUOT] all joined the President in this visit through New England.

I wish to add to the previous insertions, the other remarks of the President in the course of his visit to New England. These include an address stressing personal responsibility which was delivered at Kingston, R.I. In Manchester, N.H., the President concerned himself with the situation in Vietnam. His speech at Burlington, Vt. dealt with a subject which, as I noted earlier, is one of deep interest to him—that is, conservation, both as an expression of a sheer love of the natural beauty of America and as an urgent and practical necessity for the recreation of an ever-increasing population. It also honored the dean of the Republicans in this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the author of the rural water projects plan.

In Lewiston, Maine, the President touched briefly and simply on the bread-and-butter questions of prices, wages, and income. Again, he underscored the importance of personal responsibility and of voluntary self-discipline in these matters.

Finally, at Campobello, the President's thoughts turned to a predecessor who

did so much to mold Mr. Johnson's domestic political philosophy and his concepts of international realities. He spoke of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, in his younger years, vacationed frequently in the inspiring quietude of Campobello Island and of Mr. Roosevelt's dedication to peace even in the midst of war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the five statements previously alluded to be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND, KINGSTON, R.I.

It is a pleasure just to be in this beautiful State. I have never come here without feeling your special warmth, and I have never left here without regret. By now I am something of a commuter, having campaigned here, accepted two honorary degrees here, and sent my heart here when the returns came in—in November, 1964.

This is to say nothing of my more frequent contacts with Rhode Island—through two great progressive Senators, JOHN PASTORE and CLAIBORNE PELL, and two outstanding Congressmen, JOHN FOGARTY and FERNAND ST GERMAIN, and my old friend, Bill Miller of Texttron—the first National Chairman of Plans for Progress. If there is a State better represented in the nation, it would be hard to identify it.

I want to speak to you this morning about our society—about some of the stress it is undergoing, and about what I believe we must do if we are to preserve civil peace and serve social justice.

If there is a single word that describes our form of society, it may be the word "voluntary."

The American experience has been one long effort to open up new and better choices for our people. Generally, though not universally—we have succeeded. Most men are free to pursue any calling they choose, to do with their lives and property what they will.

The results are mixed, but the tremendous prosperity we enjoy, and the personal liberty we cherish, are at least good evidence that the system works.

Yet that prosperity would soon collapse, and that liberty would become a hollow word, if our people did not understand in their hearts that personal responsibility is forever bound to personal rights.

Most of us know this, believe it, prefer it, and practice it.

Most of us know that our own safety and well-being depend on a fabric of responsibility woven between man and man. Where it is torn by violence or avarice or carelessness, each of us suffers—not the least him who failed in his responsibility toward the rest of us.

Because most people are fair and do not, as a moral matter, want to do harm or to take unfair advantage, the fabric of private responsibility holds fast.

Yet our society grows more and more complex, the fabric is strained. Great forces are released that threaten to destroy it—forces of technology, of population growth, of immense and anonymous institutions. And as the prosperity of the majority becomes more evident, the poverty of the minority becomes more unbearable.

People who have been denied basic human rights for centuries begin to demand a share in the society. The gap between what they want and what they have is boldly revealed. The proud assertions of our democracy are challenged.

To many more fortunate people, the call of the poor minority for justice is the occasion for fear. They believe it cannot be

answered without depriving them of what they possess by birth or hard work. They see political rights and economic well-being as a cake whose size is constant. If the poor minority is granted a piece of it, the share of the affluent majority must be diminished.

In a sense, they are right. If one man—one king or dictator—holds all the political power in a country, granting five people the right to vote and shape their destiny reduces his power considerably. Granting that right to every man reduces it drastically.

Yet we long ago decided that our concept of man's integrity required this sharing of political power. The majority ought to determine the course of the state. We are working now to make that possible in every part of our country—for the first time since slaves set foot on our soil. And we shall succeed. No power on earth can prevent us.

Far more difficult, because it is far more wide-spread and complex, is the question of economic rights. We decided long ago that our economic system should not be controlled by government decree. We chose freedom in the market place, just compensation for all, and for all a chance to share in the country's wealth.

If that share can be obtained through the free market, so much the better. But where it is denied to some because of the wretched circumstances of their birth, the poverty of their education, the foul environment that surrounds them, the sickness that weakens and the despair that crushes them, we believe that the nation should act.

We believe that just as a man has the right to choose those who shall govern the state, so does he have the right to live in a decent environment, to acquire the skills that useful work requires, and to secure and hold a job despite the color of his skin or the region of his birth or the religion of his fathers.

There is a moral as well as a practical basis for this belief. One of the holy men of our years—Pope John the 23rd—described it in a great message to mankind.

He wrote, "One may not take as the ultimate criteria in economic life the interests of individuals or organized groups, nor unregulated competition, nor excessive power on the part of the wealthy, nor the vain honor of the nation or its desire for domination, or anything of this sort. Rather, it is necessary that economic undertakings be governed by justice and charity as the principal laws of social life."

Justice and charity demand that political and economic rights be granted. But justice and charity demand also that political and economic responsibilities be accepted.

For our society cannot maintain itself, or guarantee justice and fairness to any man, where only rights are acknowledged.

In the law courts, in the city halls and school boards, in Congress and in the White House, men are constantly trying to balance one man's rights fairly with another's. And this entire work of balancing—of seeking justice between men—rests on the acceptance of responsibility among men.

So, men have the right to protest the conditions of their lives—but they also have the responsibility not to injure the person or property of others in making that protest.

Men have the right to seek work wherever they can find it—but they also have the responsibility not to deprive others of their livelihood by violence.

Men have the right to use the law—but they also have the responsibility to obey it.

This lesson has particular meaning for those who are filled with anger and frustration because of the deprivation of centuries—in our own country and throughout the world.

No one needs the law more than they. Yet to many the law is the symbol of the society they have been unable to enter—the protector of the status quo, the defender



of those who have gouged and drained and denied them.

They seek to strike out against that society, to bring down the law that is its bulwark. Their mistrust of the law, and those it protects, is as deep as their despair, as profound as their frustration.

Now their demands—once whispered—have risen to a shout. And no one who enjoys the benefits of our society can say we have done enough to answer them. We have done much in our time; we are willing to do more; we know we must do more. But still the vicious cycle of poverty persists, hobbling the human personality from generation to generation.

If a single act of government, a single program or combination of programs, could break that chain overnight, I would recommend it to Congress within the hour of its discovery.

But the causes and conditions of poverty are too deep, too various, too subtle, too firmly interlocked for simple remedies. We deceive ourselves, and the poor as well, if we imagine there is some magic sword—some Excalibur of Federal funds—that can cut this chain with a stroke.

Does this mean that we should not put new billions into schools, into health care, into housing? Of course not.

What it means is that breaking the chain of poverty will require time, and wise planning, and a degree of daring experiment, and the long-term commitment of our immense resources.

It means that a major goal of government must be to secure the right to social justice for all our people—and to help them fulfill that right. It means that our laws must be wise and their enforcement fair.

Yet if all these are forthcoming—as I believe they will be—it will avail us nothing if our society is torn by violence and discord.

The Molotov cocktail destroys far more than the police car or pawn shop. It destroys the basis for civil peace and social progress.

The poor suffer twice at the rioter's hands: First, when his destructive fury scars their neighborhoods; second, when the atmosphere of accommodation and consent is changed to one of hostility and resentment.

The Negro American has made great gains in the past decade behind the banner of peaceful protest. The fury of bigots and bullies to these gains has only served to strengthen the will of our people that justice be done. The vivid contrast between lawful assemblies and lawless mobs has spurred our conscience. We have begun to act—at last—to open real opportunities for the Negro American, and to help him move to achieve them.

We shall continue, multiplying and enlarging our efforts. Yet they can succeed only in conditions of civil peace. And civil peace can exist only when all men, Negro and white alike, are as dedicated to satisfying their responsibilities as they are to securing their rights.

For we are, after all, one nation. It is our destiny to succeed or fail as a single people—not as separate races.

The great Rhode Islander, Roger Williams, described us for what we are: "There goes many a ship to sea," he said, "with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and this is a true picture of a commonwealth, or a human combination or society."

Such was the society of Providence Plantations three centuries ago. Such is the society of this America today.

Thank you.

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT MANCHESTER, N.H.

I did not come here today to make a formal speech. But I would like to share

some thoughts with you on the subject of Vietnam—a subject never far from my mind and I know never far from yours, either.

While we gather here in the peaceful Merrimack Valley, three hundred thousand Americans are braving conflict in Southeast Asia. It is only right that we constantly ask ourselves: Why?

I have gone into almost every State in this Union—I have been on television time and time again—to try to answer that question. The answer is not simple, for there are times when the war there seems a thousand contradictions. But I think most Americans know why Vietnam is important.

They know that Communism must be halted in Vietnam just as it was halted in Western Europe, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea, and in the Caribbean. They know that if aggression succeeds there when it has failed in so many other places, a harsh blow would be dealt to the security of Free Asia and to the peace most of the world knows today.

Few people realize that world peace has reached voting age. It has been twenty-one years since that day on the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay when World War II came to an end. Perhaps it reflects poorly on our world that men must fight limited wars to keep from fighting larger wars; but that is the condition of the world.

I said in Manchester two years ago that we must stand firm when the vital interests of freedom are under attack. I said we must use our overwhelming power with restraint.

We are following this policy in Vietnam because we know that the restrained use of power has for twenty-one years prevented the wholesale destruction the world faced in 1914 and again in 1939.

Every war, large or small, is brutal and ugly and claims its toll in lives and fortune. We can pray that one day even "limited war" will be an archaic term, but until Communism finally abandons aggression and lets the world live in peace, we must be prepared to deal with force.

Our hope is that the North Vietnamese will realize they cannot succeed in taking over South Vietnam and will turn to the task of helping their own people and building their own nation. In that work of peaceful building, they will find us as willing to help as they have found us determined in resisting aggression.

For our quarrel is not with the people of North Vietnam.

Our resistance is against those in Hanoi who seek to conquer the South. We are more than eager to let North Vietnam live in peace if it will only let South Vietnam do the same. Both publicly and privately we have let the leaders of the North know that if they will stop sending troops into South Vietnam, we will immediately stop bombing military targets in their own country.

For our objective is to let the people of South Vietnam decide what kind of government and what kind of country they want. They cannot do this while armed troops from North Vietnam are waging war against their people and villages.

There are people who think that the conflict in Vietnam is just an American war. Nothing could be farther from the truth. You realize this when you consider the effort this small war-torn country is making in comparison with ours.

South Vietnam is 50,000 square miles smaller than New England, and its population is about the same as New York's. But the per capita income of New England is more than 25 times the per capita of South Vietnam.

Yet the people of South Vietnam have sustained a bitter and violent struggle against an enemy within and without for many years—their army has suffered 40,000 killed in action since 1960, and at least three times as many wounded.

The Vietnamese have been subjected day and night to terror, harassment and intimidation. In the first six months of this year, Communists killed 947 civilians and kidnapped more than 1,500 others. They killed 63 civil officials—mostly village chiefs—and kidnapped 53. Last year they killed almost 2,000 civilians and kidnapped 10,000.

A million refugees fled south when South Vietnam was divided, and a million more have fled in the last few years from Communist-infested areas.

And as almost always happens in wartime, South Vietnam suffered a potentially ruinous inflation. In one year, the cost of living index in Saigon rose 92%.

Despite these burdens, the people of South Vietnam are making a dual effort to defeat the Communists and to move their country forward in the midst of war.

Almost 650,000 Vietnamese are in uniform, well over double the number of American troops there.

They have launched a program of Revolutionary Development to restore safety and bring social and economic progress to the countryside. Almost 2,300 self-help projects—roads, bridges, fishponds, dispensaries, schoolrooms, pigpens—have been completed since the beginning of the year.

And even in the midst of war, South Vietnam is trying to hold elections and move toward a government chosen by the people. This is not an easy task, and it will not happen overnight, but let us not forget that it is happening.

The Communists do not want these elections to succeed. They are stepping up their well-planned war against innocent people. We can expect more intimidation and terror as the September election draws near.

We can expect more kidnapping and murder, more raids against civilian leaders, more atrocities, and more acts of sabotage.

But we can also expect the elections to be held and the Vietnamese to continue to put down foundations of self-government.

To give them time to build is one reason we are there. For there are times when the strong must provide a shield for those on whom the Communists prey. This is such a time.

We are there for yet another reason, and that is because the United States must stand behind its word—even when conditions have added to the cost of honoring a pledge given a decade ago.

I do not have to remind you that our pledge was in fact given by solemn treaty to uphold the security of Southeast Asia. Now that security is in jeopardy because the Communists are trying to use force to take over South Vietnam. When adversity comes is no time to back down on our commitment if we expect our friends around the world to have faith in our word.

Circumstances have changed in the last ten years and the dangers are higher. But these do not excuse us from our commitment. The people of South Vietnam have staked their lives and their future on this pledge. If we were to abandon them now their fate would be cruel and their sacrifices in vain.

Let no one doubt that it has been the North Vietnamese Communists who keep on raising the stakes in Vietnam. There were people in South Vietnam—who for years sought to force Communist rule on their fellow citizens. They accomplished very little until, in 1959, North Vietnam moved soldiers and supplies to the South and transformed insurgency into invasion.

Last year the rulers of Hanoi stepped up their attacks, apparently believing that we would not persevere. They were wrong. We would not quit, and we would not leave the South Vietnamese to be conquered by force. We increased our fighting force to its present strength today of almost 300,000 men. Never have Americans had more reason to



be proud of the courage and skill of their troops; they have been magnificent.

I wish that I could tell you today that the end is in sight. To do so would be folly, for only the Communists would gain from such fiction. This week one of our large newspapers reported that the "Johnson Administration" now believes the war will be over by a certain year. I wish that this were so. I even wish I had the information that newspaper has. But I do not know one responsible official in Washington who can name the day or the month or even the year when the Communists will end the fighting or seek a peaceful settlement.

It may be one month or many. It may be one year or several. No one knows but the men in Hanoi. They hold the passkey to peace; only they can decide when the objective they seek is no longer worth the cost it carries.

Until peace comes, our course is clear. We will keep our commitment, carry on our determination, and do what we must to help protect South Vietnam and maintain the stability of Asia.

We will continue to do everything we can to limit the conflict, for we have no desire to do more than what is necessary. Our policy is not to destroy North Vietnam. It is not to go to war with any other nation. It is to stop the Communists from trying to force their will on the South; it is to provide a shield behind which the free nations of Asia can build the kind of societies they choose—without interference from any other power.

Let me also say that the hand of the United States can be as open and generous in peace as it is clenched and firm in conflict. To those who oppose us I want to repeat what we have said so often: that we seek neither territory nor bases, economic domination nor military alliances in Vietnam. We seek for the people of Vietnam, North and South, only what they want for themselves.

It must be clear, especially to those in the South who worked with the Communists to seize control by force, that their choice no longer includes a military takeover. They must know that North Vietnam cannot succeed in the conquest of South Vietnam. Let all of those, therefore, who are tired of war and death and suffering know that they have nothing to gain by continuing their support of the Communist cause.

Our task, in the meantime, is to carry on until the Communists grow weary and turn from the use of force. When that day comes, our men can come home and the people of Vietnam can go on with the work of building their country.

Until that day comes, we must persist. And persist we will.

Thank you.

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BURLINGTON, VT.

I have been reading in the magazines and seeing on television lately some of the problems at Yosemite Park, three thousand miles from your Green Mountain National Forest. But if you will ask the Forest Rangers here, they will tell you that they face some of the same problems.

The problem—as it was explained in those reports—is summed up in one word: Crowds. So many people are swarming to Yosemite—and to the Green Mountain National Forest which was visited last year by 800,000 Americans—and to all our other national parks and national forests—that when they arrive, what they have come to see and experience is obscured by crowds. We are told they simply move the city with them.

And this, as it has been reported, is due to a host of 20th century maladies: a population explosion, a rootless streak in our national character, and an urge to pave the whole country with concrete.

Let me tell you here today that the reality of what's happening in outdoor America is just not quite that simple, or quite that dreadful.

Let me note first, that crowds at Yosemite and crowds at the Green Mountain National Forest are not primarily a symptom of either a malignant population explosion or of some kind of spreading urban madness.

These crowds show that more Americans are out enjoying themselves than ever before; they have cars, and vacations, and fine roads to follow. That's a good way to spend part of a summer, and I think that most of the people at Yosemite and at the Green Mountain National Forest feel the same way.

When I was a boy, the 50-mile trip from Johnson City to the State capitol at Austin was considered a long journey. My father used to give a nickel to the first youngster who could see the capitol dome on the horizon in Austin. That was his way of keeping us awake. Today, people travel hundreds and thousands of miles just to see the beauty and the grandeur of the American countryside.

Thirty years ago, when I first came to Congress, we started to build an America where men and women and children could earn enough to own a car and to enjoy a vacation and to travel where they pleased. I do not think we should apologize here today for the fact that many Americans are enjoying precisely that kind of a vacation this summer. We do not need to apologize that the number of campers and boaters and travelers are soaring. For this is good news to those of us who have worked to help build this kind of America.

So I did not come here to be a crisis-monger and to decry the fact that crowds of Americans on this August day are out enjoying themselves. Something in that speaks of America.

But now that we have noted what is in fact happening, and noted why it is happening, we must also realize that as our ability to enjoy nature and leisure is increasing sharply, we have to work hard toward conservation if we are to pass along our heritage of national beauty to our children. We also need to improve upon this heritage where we have allowed it to tarnish.

As I look out over Lake Champlain, I cannot help recalling that only yesterday I visited another lake that aroused an entirely different emotion in me. That emotion was discouragement. For Lake Erie is polluted. It has become a casualty of heedless progress.

Some already say that Lake Erie can never be reclaimed. I do not accept that view. But I do know that it can be reclaimed only by one of the most massive efforts in the history of this country.

And Lake Erie is not alone. As I flew to New England yesterday, I saw other areas that have been stained. I saw smog hanging over cities, rivers abandoned by man and fish alike, rusting skeletons of discarded automobiles littering our countryside. I saw cities that housed within their limits the slums of filth and neglect.

Much of America is still a beautiful land, but we have already foolishly sacrificed too much of our treasure through indifference. I want to tell you here today that we can be indifferent no longer.

Just as I am no crisis-monger, neither am I a stand-patter. This is not the best of all possible worlds—far from it—and we are out to make it a better place to live and a better place to enjoy.

That is why we have to ask ourselves today the hard questions about tomorrow. Where will Americans swim? Where will Americans camp? Where will we experience the joys of nature as God really created it? Where will we fish the good streams and where will we relax away from the noise of factories and automobiles?

These are some of the questions that must be answered and answered now.

Each year in America about one million acres of virgin land turns beneath the blade of the bulldozer. Highways, shopping centers, housing developments and airports replace trees and streams and woods where young boys once dreamed dreams.

These are man-made projects to build a better life for Americans, but too often they spread ugliness and blight farther and farther across our land.

Accordingly, we must be ever vigilant to see that we not only use land but that we save land as well.

When I assumed this office I said I was going to be a conservation President. Thanks to Mrs. Johnson—and to the imagination and efforts of leaders like your own Governor Huff—I have become a beautification President as well.

I have had help; a lot of it. I have had the help of two of the great Congresses in the history of this Nation. Working together, we have given the American people 48 major conservation bills in the more than 2½ years that I have been President.

We have set aside 145 miles of warm, sandy seashore for Americans to enjoy.

We have set aside 550,000 more acres for our national park system.

We have passed the most far-reaching anti-water and air-pollution measures of all time.

We have constructed dams to protect our citizens from the ravages of floods—and behind those dams we have built lakes and recreation areas for boating and camping and fishing and swimming.

We have established a Land and Water Conservation Fund to help states and counties and towns acquire their own recreation areas.

We have promised our motorists that their major highways will be free of unsightly billboards and will be screened from ugly junkyards.

We have passed a Wilderness Act that in the years to come will set aside nine million acres of land to be maintained in their primeval condition.

We have inaugurated a new beauty program which has attracted the support of thousands of civic-minded American citizens.

Because of these efforts, it is my pleasure to make an important announcement that has been long overdue. For the first time, America is winning the battle of conservation. Every year now, we are saving more land than we are losing.

The bulldozer still claims its million acres every year, but in fiscal year 1965 Americans gained 1,150,000 acres for recreational use. That is land which can never be taken away from our people.

Last year we did even better. A million acres still went to new expanding urban developments, but we saved almost a million and a quarter acres of land. And this year, as another million acres go to urban development, we will be setting aside over 1,700,000 acres in local, state and public areas.

A few generations ago, when the public was getting interested in conservation, Uncle Joe Cannon, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, issued one of his many ultimatums. He said: "Not one cent for scenery." And he meant it.

This generation has repealed Cannon's law. And we've just begun to fight.

We have many programs underway to maintain and restore and enhance the natural beauty of their area. We're supporting legislation now before the Congress to establish a vast Connecticut River National Recreational Area in Vermont, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. Our hope is for a clean bright sparkling river dedicated to the use and enjoyment of all.

We have underway a survey of the economic impact of vacation homes in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine. We have awarded over \$600,000 in recreation grants from the land and water conservation fund.



to Vermont and your political subdivisions here. You have matched these grants dollar for dollar. Over \$150,000 of this is being used to expand camping facilities in twelve of your State parks.

You have a number of other natural and beauty recreational projects underway. Other State and Federal recreation and highway officials are watching with interest your program of developing scenic corridors along your fine roads.

These are memorable years in conservation, and they are important to every area of the Nation.

They may indeed bear a greater importance to the Nation than even the resounding triumphs of the pioneer conservationists. The great accomplishments of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot centered on the West, and for many years Americans thought of conservation as a Western program.

No longer is that the case. Our foremost achievements today are in the densely populated Northeast and Pacific and Southwestern sections of our nation. In the Northeast, cities, counties and the State will acquire nearly 350,000 acres of public recreation land this year. They will acquire about 140,000 acres in the Pacific Southwest.

We are winning our fight for conservation and we are winning it where it counts most—where it is most accessible to our people.

As I look out across Lake Champlain from this inspiring "Battery Park" height, I have no trouble imagining what Rudyard Kipling felt when he called the sunset view here one of the two finest on earth. I have always held, and I am sure you have, too, a deep respect and reverence for the truly inspiring beauty of this land of ours.

People are sailing and fishing and enjoying themselves even now on that lake. Many of you will picnic somewhere in the natural splendor of this beautiful State today before you go home. All this is as it should be, and I wish I could join you. This comes naturally to many Americans, for we are a people whose national character was forged in the out-of-doors among just this kind of God-given splendor.

I want to pledge to you today that we will retain that splendor in America.

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT LEWISTON, MAINE

I am happy to be in Lewiston today—happy to be back in Maine.

Two years ago I stood on the steps of the City Hall in Portland and quoted from a message that Governor Joshua Chamberlain once sent to the Maine legislature. He said:

"A government has something more to do than govern and levy taxes to pay the Governor. . . . Government must also encourage good, point out improvements, open roads of prosperity, and infuse life into all the right enterprises."

I promise then that we would try to follow that course. And I have come back today to report that we have lived up to that promise. Your government—and never forget that it is your government—has been infusing life into one right enterprise after another.

And we have only begun.

There is no better example of this than the promising new Dickey Hydroelectric Project. We are going to put \$300 million into this project, and every one of those dollars will be a good, sound investment in the future of Maine and in the future of our country.

So many people have been listening so long to the old voices crying, "Big Government! Big Government!" that they haven't caught up with the fact that the United States has become a very big country.

Our population increased by two million people last year alone. Half a century from now it could include over 400 million Americans.

We cannot have a stage coach government in the era of orbiting astronauts. Government has to keep up with the times, and it has to stay ahead of the problems. For too long we lagged behind and now we are trying to catch up.

I do not believe government should be the lord and master of all it surveys. The best government helps people to help themselves. That is what your government is trying to do.

Building a great society is not the job of a President alone. It is not the sole responsibility of a Congress. It cannot be done only in Washington. It has to be the special goal of every citizen. Every American has to pitch in and improve the corner of the country where he lives.

We can pass laws to bring justice to all our people, whatever their color. We can spend money for housing, education, and training. But until we have a domestic good neighbor policy on every block in every city, there will be racial strife in America.

We can start new programs to try to clean up the ghettos of our cities, but until the people who live in our suburbs are color blind, there will be discrimination in America.

We can establish training programs for young people who need a second chance, but until law-abiding citizens give them a second chance, there will be delinquency in America.

If I could write one letter to every American citizen, I would make it brief but direct. I would say:

"My fellow citizen, democracy depends on whether you are willing to conduct yourself as if the destiny of many others were in your hands, and as if the future and character of our Nation were to be decided by what you are and what you do. Live every day with the knowledge that America is the sum total of all the decisions you and people like you are making this very hour."

I would write that letter because I believe that what America needs more than anything else right now is a strong dose of self-discipline. We need it to carry on in Vietnam. We need it to bring racial peace and social justice to all our citizens. And we need it to maintain the strong economy that is the underpinning of our material strength.

Let me illustrate what I mean.

People are talking about inflation today like they used to talk about unidentified flying objects: What is it? Where is it going? Where did it come from?

We don't know all the answers, but I think we have to put the problem of inflation into perspective—and not just in terms of the early 1930s when prices were low but few people had much money to buy anything. I mean the perspective that comes from looking at both sides of the prosperity coin—at both rising prices and at the standard of living.

There is poverty in America and there is want and there is hunger—there is too much of each. But most of you in Lewiston, like most of your fellow Americans, are enjoying the best standard of living you have ever known—and the best standard of living in the world.

Prices have gone up; they have gone up eight percent since 1961. They will probably go up again. But during the same period of time, wages have gone up 17 percent and most of you can buy more today than you could with your pay check six years ago. One hour of your earnings last year bought more bread and more butter and more milk than it did in 1960.

And that is a fact.

It is also true that Americans are eating better food at a lower real cost than ever

before. After paying taxes, your family is spending about 18% of its income on food compared to 26% twenty years ago.

So I repeat: Prices have gone up, but so has your standard of living. I hope you will keep that in perspective.

This is not to say that we should ignore the threat of inflation. Keeping things in perspective will not chase the threat away. I want you to know that as your President, I am deeply concerned by rising prices.

But I am as deeply concerned with finding the right way to deal with inflation. And that brings me back to my central point: self-discipline.

The ideal way to keep the economy healthy without inflation is restraint on the part of those whose decisions have a real impact on prices. For two and one-half years I have urged business and labor to bargain collectively to reach decisions that will not trigger inflation. No one wins with inflation, including the people responsible for it.

I am proud to say that many businessmen and many labor leaders responded with restraint and self-discipline. I am sad to report that not all have, and as a result we are faced today with a real danger to the prosperity we have enjoyed for almost six consecutive years.

Unless there is restraint now, unless there is voluntary self-discipline by management and labor, your government will be compelled by sheer necessity to take action.

For in a democracy, the interest of the people is overriding; and it is government's duty to protect that interest.

On every front the dangers of excess are real: in our cities, excess decay; in our streets, excess violence; in our economy, excess indifference to the public interest.

In each, the answer is voluntary self-discipline. And that is the duty of every citizen.

#### TEXT OF THE REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, NEW BRUNSWICK, CANADA

Mr. Prime Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very proud to be on this historic island with the distinguished Prime Minister of our neighbor and close friend, Canada.

If Campobello had not been located between our two nations, I think President Roosevelt would have moved it here. He had a reverence for the island just as he had a deep affection, Mr. Prime Minister, for your country and your people.

When I first came to Washington 35 years ago, Franklin Roosevelt was only a few months away from the Presidency.

Before his death fourteen years later, he was to help change forever America's course in world affairs. And he was to leave on a young Congressman an enduring awareness of both the limits and the obligations of power.

I saw President Roosevelt on occasion during those years of intense debate over America's response to aggression in Asia and Europe. I saw his concern grow as one test after another gave belligerent powers increasing confidence that they could get away with aggression.

Here, at Campobello—where the memory of Franklin Roosevelt is strong—I am reminded of how those years have shaped the realities of our own time.

First, we know that our alternatives are sometimes determined more by what others do than by our own desires.

We do not choose to use force, but aggression narrows the alternatives—either we do nothing, and let aggression succeed; or we take our stand to resist aggression.

We would always choose peace, but when others mean peace at the expense of someone's freedom, the alternative is unacceptable.



Second, we know that a nation can influence events just as much by withdrawing its power as by using its power.

Third, we know that unrest and instability in one part of the world are a real danger to other areas. If hostilities in strategic areas can be contained, they will be less likely to threaten world peace with a confrontation of nations possessing unlimited power.

Fourth, we know that a safe world order depends as much on a large power's word and will as on its weapons. For the world to be secure, our friends must trust our treaties and our adversaries must respect our resolve.

Fifth, we know that power carries with it a mandate for restraint and patience: restraint, because nuclear weapons have raised the stakes of unmeasured force; and patience, because we are concerned with more than tomorrow.

No man loved peace more than Franklin Roosevelt. It was in the marrow of his soul, and I never saw him more grieved than when reports came from the War Department of American casualties in a major battle.

But he led this Nation courageously in conflict—not for war's sake, but because he knew that beyond war lay the larger hopes of man.

And so it is today. The history of mankind is the history of conflict and agony—of war and rumors of war. Still today we must contend with the cruel reality that some men still believe in force and seek by aggression to impose their will on others. That is not the kind of world we want, but it is the kind of world we have.

The day is coming when those men will realize that aggression against their neighbors does not pay. It will be hastened if every nation that abhors war will apply all the influence at their command to persuade the aggressors from their chosen course.

For this is the real limit of power: we have the means of unlimited destruction, but we do not have the power alone to make peace. Only when those who promote aggression agree to reason will the world know again the blessings of peace. That day will come and once men realize that aggression bears no rewards, it may be that the deepest hopes of Franklin Roosevelt—hopes for a genuine peace and an end to war of every kind—will be realized.

It is good to be here with a man to whom peace has been a life-long pursuit. American Presidents and Canadian Prime Ministers have always had a close and informal arrangement reflecting the ties that bind our two countries together.

On this occasion, may we all remember the courage and strength of a man whose name grows even larger with each passing year: Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

#### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY ACT OF 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed S. 3158, the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966; the bill was managed on the floor by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] who demonstrated anew his well-earned reputation as one of the best versed Members of the Senate in the field of banking legislation and fiscal matters in general. The expeditious manner in which the legislation was handled is a testimonial to his great ability as a manager of complicated legislation; this swift passage demonstrates the sure satisfaction of the 99 other inquisitive minds in this body.

To his counterpart on the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senate owes

again its gratitude for his articulate contribution to the passage of that bill and the leadership in particular wishes to thank him for his unfailing cooperation.

In like manner, the leadership wishes to thank the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for his penetrating contributions to this measure. His proposals in this field were to some extent adopted by S. 3158; his attention to the problems generating this legislation was the strong impetus needed to bring about enactment of this bill.

The leadership wishes to thank all members of the Banking and Currency Committee for the contribution they have made to producing this bill as well as the many other significant bills considered from that committee on the Senate floor the past 2 weeks. Not only the housing legislation and the mass transit but the demonstration cities bills were their work product and the Senate is thankful for the great effort the entire committee has made.

#### A BILL TO AMEND THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT TO PROVIDE A FIXED ALLOTMENT PERCENTAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Federal funds are allotted for the basic support of the vocational rehabilitation program in the United States. The allotment percentage, derived from the per capita income of a State, is a basic factor in computing the allotments made to the States and territories under the act. According to the formula which distributes these Federal funds, the higher the per capita income of a State, the lower the Federal allotment percentage.

The District of Columbia since 1954 for the purposes of the act has been treated as a State. During this time the District has been among the top three States as to its per capita income and at the present time ranks at the top. The District, an entirely urban area, has a level of per capita income which, while comparable to the level of other central cities of standard statistical metropolitan areas, is considerably above the level of per capita income of States where generally, the per capita income of rural areas and small cities tends to pull the level down. This results in the District, being highest in per capita income, receiving the smallest allotment percentage—33½ percent—and, therefore, a comparatively small allotment of Federal funds.

The District's rehabilitation program, although operating in only one large city, has to cover both the functions and responsibilities for overall program direction ordinarily assumed by an agency of State government, and those ordinarily exercised by the State through its district offices in cities, counties, and other political subdivisions. This dual responsibility, together with the needed expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program in the District, suggests that the most equitable treatment would be that

used by the Congress in providing for unique situations in other jurisdictions which are not one of the 50 States.

The District of Columbia presently is not able to expand its program to greater capacity, due mainly to its being considered under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as a State. The bill which I am introducing would increase the District of Columbia's allotment percentage to 75 percent, the same as other jurisdictions requiring special consideration, such as Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This change would be made at the beginning of a new fiscal year, July 1, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3754) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide a fixed allotment percentage for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3754

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11(h) (1) (B) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "the allotment percentage for".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

#### FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 759 AND 760

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appear under separate headings.)

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3207) to prohibit desecration of the flag.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator PASTORE be added to the list of cosponsors of the joint resolution I introduced (S.J. Res. 85), proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, and that his name be listed among the sponsors at the next printing of the joint resolution.



The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH OF THE ELDERLY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I would like to announce to the Senate that the Health of the Elderly Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Aging will hold hearings on September 20, 21, and 22. The subject of the hearings will be "Detection and Control of Chronic Disease Utilizing Multiphasic Health Screening Techniques."

Early returns from a number of health screening projects that have been in operation in recent years indicate that the techniques developed thus far offer great promise for their utilization in the detection of certain chronic diseases in their early stages, in some instances before they become symptomatic.

The 89th Congress has done much to better the health lives of the elderly, but our efforts have been directed, primarily, to the treatment of the diseased elderly, rather than to preserving their health in the first instance.

Certainly the adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" has no greater application than in the field of health. It may well be that the "ounce of prevention" for many diseases is available to us now in the appropriate use of space age technology adapted to health problems. It is hoped that the hearings will develop a compendium of information for the use of the Senate in formulating programs to assure that every "ounce of prevention" is made available so that the lives of our elderly may be even more enriched.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 602. An act to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; and

S. 2663. An act for the relief of Dinesh Poddar and Girish Kumar Poddar.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STOP THE INVASION TALK

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the flamboyant young Prime Minister, Ky, of the Saigon government recently urged that instead of waging a long war

to win a victory in South Vietnam, North Vietnam should be invaded by land forces Vietnam and invading from the sea, pouring over the 17th parallel from South. This was an irresponsible statement typical of the reckless and brash young puppet that we have installed as head of the Saigon government.

What is frightening is the fact that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, when asked to comment on this statement at a press conference, said:

There is no policy desire to move into North Vietnam or the demilitarized zone.

It will depend, Mr. Rusk said, "on the turn of events; the commander will have to do those things to protect the security of his troops."

Mr. President, of course a field commander has the obligation to do those things necessary to protect the security of his troops. However, the Founding Fathers, the architects of our Constitution, provided that civilian authority should always be supreme over the military. If it is not our policy to move into North Vietnam and the demilitarized zone, then the civilian leaders of this Nation have the obligation to instruct our field commanders to keep their forces out of areas where such a course of conduct might appear necessary to those field commanders, and Secretary of State Rusk should have indicated in his press conference that this has been done.

This is outrageous, frightening talk on the part of Secretary of State Rusk.

Mr. President, at one time it was considered unthinkable that we would get involved in a war in southeast Asia. It seemed unthinkable that we would bomb Hanoi and Haiphong and other densely populated areas and kill many, many civilians. It was unthinkable, so it seemed, that we would one day have more than the 300,000 men of our Armed Forces in southeast Asia, whereas, in truth and in fact, we now have approximately 500,000 men there, including our forces in Thailand and the officers and men of our 7th Fleet in the Tonkin Gulf, and in the South China Sea. Within a short time, within a very short space of time, all of those "unthinkables" have come to pass.

It should be unthinkable that we would escalate this miserable civil war in which we are involved in South Vietnam to the extent of crossing the 17th parallel and invading North Vietnam with all the risks that such a move implies. However, Secretary of State Rusk's refusal to repudiate Ky's statement indicates that, in his mind at least, that possibility exists. Should that happen, any chance of negotiating a cease-fire or armistice in Vietnam would be seriously jeopardized, if not completely destroyed. We might very well find ourselves on a collision course toward war with Red China, if not worse.

Mr. President, administration officials should at once put a stop to any idea that we would seriously consider invading North Vietnam by land. Such talk has a way of creating a climate of acceptance; before long the unthinkable becomes thinkable. Such talk should be terminated by firm assurances by State

Secretary Rusk or other top administration officials, that this Nation will not escalate the war to that extent.

Mr. President, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, there appeared a very perceptive editorial entitled "Stop the Invasion Talk." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, August 1966]

#### STOP THE INVASION TALK

Secretary of State Rusk's discussion of the possibility that American troops might invade North Viet Nam is frightening. It is difficult to believe that the United States would commit such a tragic blunder, and it is true that Mr. Rusk said, "There is no policy desire to move into North Viet Nam or the demilitarized zone" between North and South at the Seventeenth parallel.

But Mr. Rusk's discussion of the matter at a press conference indicated that an invasion, urged a few days ago by Premier Ky of South Viet Nam, was not out of the question. It will depend, Mr. Rusk said, "on the turn of events; the commander will have to do those things necessary to protect the security of his troops."

We concede that a field commander has this obligation. But his superiors have the obligation of instructing him to keep his men out of areas where such a course might appear necessary to him. A movement of infantry across the parallel would involve another drastic change in the nature of the war. It would be similar to the movement that brought the Chinese into the Korean war. It would alienate international opinion still further from United States policies. Ultimately, it might mean disaster.

The United States has recently been bombing not only North Viet Nam but the buffer zone in the vicinity of the Cambodian border, across which North Viet Nam troops are said to flee to sanctuaries. These raids, different in kind from an invasion, are taking place as Ambassador Harriman prepares to go to Cambodia to seek ways of keeping that peaceful little country out of the Indochina conflict. We certainly hope he succeeds.

Standing alone, Mr. Rusk's remarks are not so disquieting as when placed in conjunction with what Premier Ky said on two occasions within the last two weeks. In effect Ky posed the alternative of a war of five to 10 years duration or an invasion of the North, which he said he did not think would mean Chinese intervention. The State Department refused to repudiate Ky's statements; instead, it tried to dissociate itself from Ky's proposals without appearing to offend Ky.

Unfortunately, the history of United States involvement in Viet Nam is one of escalation, and so there are additional reasons for viewing the Rusk and Ky remarks with trepidation. Perhaps this is mitigated to some extent by Mr. Rusk's repeated assertion of his desire for peace in Southeast Asia, and his willingness to negotiate for it.

Any chance of negotiation would be further jeopardized, however, if not destroyed, by an invasion, and the Administration ought at once to put a stop to any idea that it could take place. Talk has a way of creating a climate of acceptance; it should be terminated by firm assurance that invasion is unthinkable.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield, if I have time remaining.



Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] for his continuing and forthright turning of the spotlight on our folly in southeast Asia. I think it is about time that the American people learned the truth about the situation.

We allegedly are there to fight aggression. The fact is that we are the aggressors. When we went into Vietnam in 1954, we were not invited in by a friendly government as has been alleged repeatedly by official pronouncements. We invited ourselves in. As we escalated, and a year and a half ago started sending our troops into combat and began bombing day after day, we became the aggressors.

When we went into Vietnam the only nationals involved were Vietnamese fighting each other. We barged in, violating every pertinent treaty in the process. It was a civil war. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], after his trip to Vietnam, came to the conclusion that it was a civil war and so stated on the floor of the Senate. He quoted statements by General Westmoreland and General Stilwell to that effect; namely, that it was a civil war. We have the earlier statement of President Kennedy that it was a civil war. More recently we have had the testimony of four knowledgeable and experienced newspapermen who have reported from the front, who appeared on television and declared that it was a civil war.

Until the American people realize that we are the aggressors they will continue to be deluded into thinking that we are pursuing a patriotic course of action. This delusion should be continually exposed. I think it is important that the American people learn that they have been deceived and misled from the very beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again I am honored and privileged to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], in respect to the unjustifiable course of action that the United States is following and has followed since the beginning in conducting our unjustifiable, immoral, and illegal war in Vietnam.

I particularly wish to associate myself with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] in his appraisal of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk. In my opinion, in his press conference Dean Rusk doubletalked again. He follows the course of propagandists who seek to mislead and confuse American public opinion.

That is why I repeat again what I have said for the past several years: The greatest need in American foreign policy is a new Secretary of State. The President sorely needs a Secretary of State who will advise him on the basis of the facts and stop duping him.

I particularly regret the attempt on the part of Dean Rusk, in his latest press conference, to tell the American people

that if John Fitzgerald Kennedy were alive he would be supporting our present American war policy in South Vietnam. I do not believe there is a scintilla of fact that supports this misrepresentation and distortion by the Secretary of State.

I am satisfied, as I have said on the floor of the Senate before, that from my last conference with the late President, quite the opposite would be the case had he lived. I speak on the basis of what came from the late President's lips in my last conference with him. I am satisfied as he told me that he was engaging in a complete reappraisal of our foreign policy in South Vietnam. I subsequently learned that he had been greatly influenced by the Galbraith report which had been made to the late President by his request. President Kennedy had that report under study at the time of his death. I am reliably advised that the Galbraith report did not support American war policy in South Vietnam, but it was quite to the contrary.

#### INTEREST RATES AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Government has now released official statistics which confirm that the cost of living rose sharply last month. This is a continuation of a trend that has been underway throughout the year. I find it disturbing that the trend shows signs of rapid acceleration. For instance, the cost of living has advanced 3.1 points on the Consumer Index during the past 12 months. The greatest part of that increase, however, has occurred within the last 6 months. Of a total increase of 3.1 points within the last year, the index has advanced 2.3 points within the last 6 months.

A further acceleration of the rate of increase may well be anticipated, but even assuming that conditions do not worsen, housewives can expect the cost of living to increase in the calendar year 1966 by about 4.6 points.

On yesterday, I called to the attention of the Senate certain facts and statistics which I find disturbing. I referred particularly to the increase in interest payments made by consumers. These interest payments by consumers have been increased by 71 percent since 1960. The current rise in interest rates will soon be reflected in a further startling increase dollarwise and percentagewise in the amount of interest paid by consumers. This, of course, is an important component of the cost of living.

One should not expect statistics to be perfect. By and large I think the Consumer Price Index gives a reasonably accurate, though necessarily delayed, composite reflection of the cost of living. One can always suggest needed refinements and revisions and interpretation, but for the sake of my points today, I take the statistics of the Consumer Price Index as they are and say to the Senate that the trend is disturbing, and from the standpoint of reference for possible legislative action, it is the trend rather than the occurrence of a particular month that is important.

The cost of living has increased 2.3 points during the last 6 months as compared to eight-tenths of a point during the previous 6 months. I do not wish to predict what the next 6 months will bring, but I do call attention to the rising pressures, the increasing demands and the artificially high interest rates that have been in part induced by action of the Government and in part encouraged by action of the Government. What will the next year bring, Mr. President, in the absence of effective action by the Government?

In 1951, as the pressures of war in Korea began to be felt throughout the economy, the Consumer Price Index rose by 6.7 points. President Truman moved to protect the public from profiteering, whether by interest rates, rents, excess war profits. President Truman led the country through the Korean war while maintaining a reasonable interest rate structure. The Vietnam war has now reached the proportions of the Korean war, but little is being done to fight inflation, little is being done to check the rising cost of living. Nothing is being done to stop high interest rates. Johnson interest rates are now higher than Hoover rates. I do not suggest that 1966 is the same as 1951, but there are some similarities. Action is needed both by the President and by Congress.

#### ASIAN PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, last week's Senate debate on the Defense Appropriation Act reflected a sober fact: there is little reason to expect that American military operations in southeast Asia will level out, much less decline, in the foreseeable future.

On the contrary, it is the considered judgment of experienced members of the Armed Services Committee and Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that our commitment to a military solution in South Vietnam will continue to grow, in terms of manpower, materiel, and expenditures.

This is a dispiriting assessment, to say the least, in view of our Government's widely and, I am sure, sincerely proclaimed willingness to seek a negotiated settlement. It is to say, by implication, that nothing much is expected of our diplomatic initiatives, at least for the indefinite future.

So it is timely, I believe, to restate some fundamentals about the role and responsibility of the United States in Asia.

The American people must—and we stand willing to—carry our full share of responsibility for world peace. Yet we have neither the wish nor the capacity to police the world. No one, to my knowledge, contends that our deep involvement in meeting aggression in Vietnam today constitutes a desirable or feasible precedent for unilateral peace-keeping in Asia or the world at large.

The primary responsibility for achieving and maintaining peace and stability in Asia must, in the final analysis, lie with the Asians. And we shall be derelict in our duty to ourselves and the Asians if we fail to shape our policies accordingly.



It is for this reason that I see special merit in the idea of an Asian conference to seek an Asian solution to the conflict in Vietnam.

An Asian conference was first suggested by Charles H. Percy some weeks ago. More recently, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, Thanat Khoman, called on Malaysia and the Philippines to join Thailand in organizing an Asian peace conference. As Mr. Thanat put it:

We have relied upon outside power to save us from being submerged under waves of aggression and we seem to have abdicated our responsibilities for peacekeeping.

The essence of the initiative proposed by Mr. Percy and the Thai Foreign Minister has since been endorsed by a number of eminent men, including former President Eisenhower and such close colleagues of mine as Senator MORTON, Senator AIKEN, and Majority Leader MANSFIELD.

None of these men, I am convinced, has any illusion that the proposed conference can settle the war overnight or quickly relieve the United States of its present burdens in southeast Asia. Nor is any such hope buttressed by the initial reactions of Peking and Hanoi to the Thai proposal. Yet the proposed conference might well point the way to the means by which the logjam could be broken.

Furthermore, an all-Asian conference would focus attention and thought on certain realities that have been pushed into the background by the escalating military struggle in Vietnam.

First is the fact that this struggle and its outcome are of primary and most direct concern, both immediately and in the long run, to the independent nations of Asia.

Second, I believe, is the fact that, real as our interest in the security of southeast Asia is and will remain, it is these Asian nations that must assume primary and major responsibility for their own security if the peace and stability of the area are to be established and maintained.

Third, the Asians may well have a better understanding of how "to get from here to there" than would Americans.

For these reasons, I very much hope that we may see increasing support for the convening of an Asian conference. And while it will be for the Asians to decide and to arrange, we should welcome and encourage such an initiative.

#### THAILAND'S NORTHEAST FRONTIER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the past several years, there has been a pattern of increased subversion and penetration of Thailand's northeast frontier by Communist agents. Both Hanoi and Peking have loudly proclaimed that Thailand is next on the list of countries to be engulfed by their misnamed wars of "national liberation." In the past 6 months, the level of radio propaganda beamed on this area from Communist radio stations has greatly increased; the rate of assassination of officials has increased from 35 in calendar 1965 to 70

in the first 6 months of this year—a quadrupling of these vicious attacks by Communist agents seeking to destroy the fabric of peaceful government in this frontier. There are many problems in meeting the Communist challenge in this area, not the least of which is establishing government programs responsive to the needs of the population. There is much work to be done and much to be learned from past failures. A critical and provocative account of the problems faced in this region was provided in an article written by Stanley Karnow in the Washington Post on August 22. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe it is the consensus of the Senate, and a view which I strongly hold, that the United States must seek to contain the conflict now raging in nearby Vietnam. That, I think, would be the view of the American people. In any expansion of the war in Asia, Thailand would be greatly threatened.

No Communist penetration, using guerrilla tactics, can succeed if it is opposed by the local populace. It is therefore imperative, Mr. President, that the United States continue, indeed, that it intensify its efforts to assist the peoples of the northeast frontier area of Thailand in achieving their goals of stable government and their hopes for an adequate standard of living.

These efforts include such humane goals as the achievement of potable water supplies, small reclamation projects, rural health programs, and a program to strengthen local police forces so that they can subsist on their salaries and do a better job of enforcement of the law free and clear from any temptations or abuse which may abound in corruption and extortion.

As compared with the multibillions of dollars that we are now required to spend on the war in Vietnam, the cost of this activity is small—in the fiscal year just ended slightly less than \$30 million was spent on these programs.

In the Foreign Assistance Act recently passed by the Senate, funds which would be provided for this kind of assistance were cut by 28 percent, as a result of a rollcall vote, bringing the total global budget for the current fiscal year for support assistance to a level below the administration's request for the Far East alone.

Mr. President, as the costs of resisting aggression are counted, we are not talking about great sums of money. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I wish to record my strong opposition to attempts to curtail this assistance and my support for such sound measures as may be proposed to stabilize the northeast frontier area in the future. Let me conclude by noting that these programs are carried out largely through representatives of local government in the area. They do not involve a risk to the lives of American youth. An extension of the war to Thailand

would be an international tragedy. It is incumbent upon all of us to give adequate consideration to see that such a tragedy may be avoided.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1966]  
INEPTNESS FRUSTRATES THAI EFFORTS TO  
COUNTER RED DRIVE IN PROVINCE

(By Stanley Karnow)

NAKORAN PHANOM, THAILAND.—Seated at a makeshift bamboo table in his jungle headquarters near this Northeast province town, the Thai Army major admitted his bewilderment.

He commands an array of troops and police deployed to uproot the bands of Communist insurgents and their sympathizers scattered through this hinterland of rice fields, teak forests and remote villages.

"But our trouble," the major said, "is that we don't know who is Communist and who is not."

That complaint is familiar to any Vietnam veteran. And in several ways, this smoldering Communist insurrection seems a repetition of the Vietnam war at its outset six or seven years ago. As they did in Vietnam at that time, the Communists here are currently killing officials, organizing cadres and promising prosperity to peasants.

Yet the most significant similarity between the two situations may lie less in the Communist challenge than in the Thai government's often awkward response.

#### BANGKOK ENTRAPPED

Indeed, there are seasoned American advisers here who submit that present Communist tactics are mainly a snare. As one of them put it, "The Communists are trapping the government into making mistakes that work in their favor."

Some of the government errors are so blatant as to be incredible in this era of counter-insurgency publicity. Like the Thai Army major who cannot identify a real Communist, military and police officers throughout this region regularly round up villagers, considering them suspect unless their innocence can be proved.

Near Nakae, a critical sector about 25 miles from here, peasants may not leave their villages without a special permit that frequently takes hours, bribes or both to obtain. In the area of Mukdahan, on the Mekong River south of here, they are prohibited from carrying food to their fields lest they nourish the Communists. As a result, many must trudge home long distances for lunch.

From all accounts, the most egregious blunders are committed by the provincial police. Operating on low wages and no expense money, they range through villages squeezing the local populace for food, lodging and girls. Uncooperative peasants may have a bone broken—or worse find themselves detained as Communists.

#### PLANTING DISRUPTED

A few months ago, during the tricky rice transplanting period a police unit barged into a village near here, ordered the peasants in from the fields and forced them to build a stockade. The peasants had no choice but to abandon their paddies.

"With this kind of nonsense," explains an American who has spent years here, "people tend to fear the government more than they do the Communists. Of course, the Communists kill officials and informers, but they are selective. The cops are indiscriminate, and so they scare everybody."

More widespread, though subtle, are government shortcomings that seem to arise from the inability of officials to understand and sympathize with ordinary citizens.

Ironically, the gap between the Establishment and the people has persisted despite



well intentioned government efforts at economic and social development in this region. Under rural programs being accelerated to meet the growing insurgency, the U.S. and Thai governments have currently committed some \$20 million to an assortment of projects for this Northeast area.

#### RURAL TEAMS HELP

Engineering teams are constructing irrigation networks, wells, roads and schoolhouses. Medical teams composed of Thai doctors and American Army corpsmen roam the countryside, dispensing medicines and treating the sick. There are Peace Corps volunteers breeding chickens and nurturing silkworms, and instructors holding seminars for villagers on such elementary subjects as how to erect fences and collect garbage.

But the key to all this activity, experts point out, is less what is being done than how it is done. The development schemes, they argue, can be politically fruitless if they fail to bring citizens closer to their government. In this region at least there is still a good deal of distance between officials and the people.

Part of the problem stems from the highly-centralized nature of the Thai government, which makes it more important for a provincial governor to please Bangkok than to satisfy his own population. Also, Thailand is a military dictatorship in which officials need not worry about constituents' votes.

At the same time, this society rests on the ancient tradition, prevalent elsewhere in Asia as well, that the authorities command and the people obey. The despotism may be benign, as it largely is here. Even so, it is still a despotism in which decisions are imposed from the top.

#### PEASANTS IGNORED

Consequently, specialists here say, the projects being built in this region are based more often on official fiat than on villagers' needs, agreement or comprehension. In several villages near here, for example, peasants have had their meager parcels of land confiscated without due compensation. In some cases, community development workers have seen their recommendations blocked by superiors unreceptive to ideas from underlings.

But for many Thais and their American advisers, the focus on the Northeast is in itself a remarkable bit of progress. It is a sector, neglected for years, that was surely headed into dissidence.

Far from the capital, the Northeast served as a Siberia for unwanted officials. Moreover, it is principally populated by an in-between people who are ethnically Laotian and politically Thai, and are not fully accepted by either nationality. As a Buddhist monk here explained it: "In Laos we're considered Thai, and in Bangkok we're considered Laotian."

The regions biggest handicap, however, has been economic. Lacking adequate water and fertile soil, its rice yields are about 40 per cent below the national average. Its per capita income, only \$45 per year, is less than half that of the rest of the country, and it is inequitably distributed. According to recent study, the upper 2 per cent of the Northeast peasants receive ten times more cash income than the lowest 78 per cent.

Perhaps nothing dramatizes the area's poverty so much as its road. On a map, the highway from Udorn through Sakorn Nakorn here to Nakorn Phanom is a bright red ribbon. In fact it is a potholed, corrugated dirt strip that, these rainy afternoons turns to mire.

#### RADICALS FROM HERE

Thai political figures from here were mostly of a radical bent. Many of them supported Pridi Phanomyong the liberal former

Premier who now lives in Communist China. The Northeast was also the center of resistance against the Japanese, with whom the Bangkok government allied during World War II.

When military dictators assumed power in Bangkok after the war, they systematically cracked down on Northeast politicians, charging them with advocating separatism, communism or both.

The massive military sweeps through here in the early 1960s instilled in the local population a fear of the Bangkok regime that still remains. The arrests and summary execution of several local leaders, many of them popular in the region, may have given the present insurgents a measure of backing in their opposition to the government.

The more generous attention now being accorded the Northeast by the government has prompted some commentators to remarks that the insurrection has been a "blessing in disguise."

But how much ground here can be held against the Communists could depend on more than money and materiel. It may require a change away from the conservative, paternalistic outlook of the Bangkok military oligarchy.

#### TAX HIKE TO STOP INFLATION COULD BRING 5 MILLION UNEMPLOYED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has provoked a debate on the floor of the Senate on economic policy, and particularly interest rate policy.

Most Senators taking part in this debate have failed to recognize, however, that if fiscal policy is going to reduce both prices and interest rates, it will have a devastating effect on the economy.

In my judgment the cost of an across-the-board tax hike to stop the rise in the cost of living would be at least 2 million additional unemployed. This would push unemployment to a 5 million level.

Our experience during the similar boom and the following recession in the middle and late fifties showed that it was only when unemployment reached 6.8 percent in 1958 that the rise in the cost of living came under control and the rate of increase fell decisively.

Such an increase from the present 3.9 percent level would mean an additional 2 million Americans out of work.

This is a selective inflation that must be fought with a surgeon's scalpel, not a butcher's cleaver. The kind of across-the-board tax hike that some Members of the Congress advocate would be strictly a meat cleaver.

Judging by our experience in the fifties, to do any good, it would have to be at least equivalent to the \$11 billion tax cut of 1964, and probably a good deal more.

If an easier monetary policy should permit interest rates to drop at the same time as some advocate, the tax hike might have to be \$20 billion.

This would mean an approximate 20-percent increase in personal and corporate income taxes.

While the moderation of price rises would be highly welcome and lower interest rates would also be helpful, the effect of such a recession on States and

municipalities would be to force a cutback on education and essential services that would be irresistible.

This is why the President is right to oppose a strictly across-the-board tax hike solution to present onerous high and rising prices and soaring interest rates.

There is a better way to meet this inflation. The best evidence shows that the rising pressures on the economy have moderated. Unemployment is right now well above its February level. It is also higher than in six of the years since 1947.

While operations continue at an uncomfortable 92 percent of plant capacity, they have not significantly increased since the beginning of the year. They remain well below the 96 percent of capacity operations of 1953.

The best hope for a balanced economic policy that will keep price rises under control and offer an early hope for a more reasonable level of interest rates is the following:

First. Continuation of wage-price guideposts with more flexibility to permit labor compensation for the rising cost of living.

Second. A selective cutback in the Federal Government's construction activities, especially roadbuilding, as long as pressure on manpower and material in the capital goods sector continues to be the most inflationary sector of the economy.

Third. Authority for the Federal regulatory agencies to end the interest rate war that has escalated rates and enabled business to continue to boom construction at the expense of the homebuilding industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in that connection President Johnson has asked Congress to enact certain legislation in this field. The measure is pending before the Senate Banking Committee. We have failed to act on it. The President has pressed for it and asked that we act on it. In my judgment, the rate war between banks and other lending agencies has greatly added to interest rate costs and has paralyzed homebuilding.

The administration is fighting hard for congressional action on this bill. If we do not act on it, it will not be because the administration has not asked us to do it.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Tennessee has recently criticized my contention that it is up to Congress to moderate through legislative initiatives the inflationary pressures now plaguing the economy. Among other objections, Senator GORE has pressed the point that it is up to the administration to submit legislation to Congress which would dampen inflationary trends.

Mr. President, I point to S. 3687, for which the administration is fighting. This would provide flexible authority for



supervisory agencies to prescribe maximum rates of return payable on deposit-type savings. This bill would:

First, grant to the Federal Reserve Board flexible authority to establish different categories of deposits for interest-rate limitations;

Second, give the same authority to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

Third, grant standby authority to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set maximum rates of interest on the share accounts of savings and loans;

Fourth, provide for coordinated use of these flexible authorities by the agencies above named;

Fifth, grant to the Federal Reserve Board the authority to raise reserve requirements to a maximum of 10 percent; and

Sixth, broaden the authority of the Federal Reserve System so that it can purchase the obligations of any agency of the U.S. Government.

The first four proposals on this list were submitted in an earlier bill, S. 3627, proposed by the Federal Reserve Board and introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. But all six proposals have the support of the Coordinating Committee on Bank Regulations and Supervision, composed of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board—in effect, the support of the administration.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has made a strong fight. Let me point out, however, that his proposal for elimination of the investment tax credit will not have any significant effect in slowing down the economy for from 9 months to a year. By then a recession could develop a situation in which we needed that lost investment credit stimulation.

#### LEADTIME BETWEEN ORDER AND DELIVERY OF PRODUCTIVE EQUIPMENT

A period of 18 months is sometimes cited as the average leadtime between contractual commitment and completion of capital projects in American industry. This rule of thumb includes both plant and equipment, a broader category than section 38 property. There are of course wide differences among investments. Many items such as office equipment and certain standard types of production machinery can normally be delivered within a few months. On the other hand, such investments as large aircraft, large electric generating plants, blast furnaces, heavy production equipment, and chemical processing equipment systems, may take 2 or 3 years or more to complete and place in service following the initial contract.

The design of specialized equipment requires considerable time, and the trend toward increasing use of specialized equipment makes this an increasingly important factor in the leadtime for capital projects.

Against this background, it has been estimated that some 40 percent of equipment subject to the credit has an order-

to-delivery time of not more than one or two quarters, another 40 percent has a delivery time of three or four quarters, and another 20 percent has delivery times ranging between 1 year and 3½ years with an average of about 2 years. Some additional time would elapse between delivery and actual installation or placement in use in some cases.

The overall weighted average time between contract and placement in use of productive equipment eligible for the investment credit is therefore estimated at between three quarters and a year. If some allowance is made for necessary advance scheduling of equipment purchases to be installed as building construction is completed, the overall average leadtime may be somewhat longer.

#### SUSPENSION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT NOT SUITABLE AS SHORT-TERM RESTRAINING FACTOR FOR THESE REASONS

Because there is a considerable "leadtime" in carrying out investment projects; because the investment credit becomes available when assets are put in service and hence present contracts are being undertaken in reliance on the availability of the credit when the project is completed; because suspension of the credit would have to provide an exception for projects already under commitment, but which will be completed in the future, it follows that suspension of the investment credit would generally not alter investment expenditures or tax revenues for a substantial period of time.

#### CURRENT SITUATION DOES NOT REQUIRE CHANGES IN FINAL INCOME TAX LIABILITIES

As the President has stated, it is not necessary or desirable to change individual or corporate final tax liabilities at this time in response to the current economic situation associated with Vietnam expenditures. Since the investment credit is a component of final income tax liabilities, it follows that the current situation does not require a suspension of the investment credit.

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The investment credit helps the balance of payments in two direct ways: First, it makes investment here in the United States more attractive; and second, it encourages modernization and cost cutting to strengthen our export position—including our defensive position vis-a-vis imports. Suspension or reduction of the investment credit in a world in which investment incentives are widely used in foreign tax systems under which our friendly international competitors operate would weaken our international competitive position.

The point I am trying to make is that if we repealed the investment tax credit today or tomorrow, it would be at least the middle or the end of 1967 before the real effect would be felt. If we acted next March or April, it would have no decisive effect until 1968.

My conclusion is that while it is healthy and desirable to discuss economic policy, we must realize that this country is in a situation in which there is no painless or easy way in which to reduce interest rates or to decrease inflationary pressures.

This is especially true if we try to do both at once.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope very much that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will report out of the committee the bill to which the Senator has made reference. I was hoping the administration would recommend much more than it did with respect to high interest rates and see that something is done, and I would hope that Congress will act on it.

Am I to understand that the bill which the administration has recommended, to which the Senator from Wisconsin referred, has passed the House?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. It is pending in both the House and the Senate. There is considerable controversy over it in the House Banking and Currency Committee, and also in the Senate committee. The President is making a vigorous fight for it. The President has asked Congress to do something about this matter which would stop the rate war that has driven up prices, and relieve paralyzed homebuilding. It is unfair and untrue to say that the administration has not taken any significant action, to hold down interest rates and to relieve increased inflationary pressures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is there a bill in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which has passed the House providing for holding down competition between private banks and building and loan associations for money to be loaned out?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; it has not passed the House. It is pending in the House and in the Senate. This bill will give the Home Loan Bank Board and other Federal regulatory agencies the power to fix maximum interest rates that are paid by such lending institutions, particularly on certificates of deposit, which have been particularly responsible for luring money away from housing with ever higher interest rates and into business and which has resulted in the housing field being depressed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This failure of the committee to act on measures of this kind is what puts pressure on Senators to come to the floor and offer amendments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is right. One of the most interesting developments I have seen in the Senate is the debate on interest rates which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has provoked, except I strongly disagree on the argument that only the President, not Congress, is responsible for high interest rates. Not only is Congress senior partner, but Congress has failed to act when the administration has fought for congressional action to stop the escalating interest rate war.



Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Banking and Currency Committee cannot find time or take an intellectual interest to act on matters of this kind, I hope members of the committee will not be too much disturbed if some of us who may be on other committees may try to be helpful.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hope the Senator will. We can use all the help we can get to get action on that bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I find, as a member of the Finance Committee, which is one of the oldest committees in the Senate, that members get impatient with that committee in considering some of the amendments they propose, and on which the committee will not act. When the measure gets on the floor, I find I have a job sometimes just getting Members to withhold those amendments, or in getting them defeated, even though we promise to hold hearings on a bill in which they are in-

terested and report a bill. Some of these measures will have to be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee. For example, it will have to consider measures to meet some of the pressures brought on by the war. So these measures will have to be considered by the Appropriations Committee, the Finance Committee, and also the Banking and Currency Committee to try to take care of necessary legislation in this field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that tables I have prepared, showing the unemployment rate, the consumer price level, the Nation's industrial production in relation to its plant capacity, for every year from 1946 to 1966, and the prime interest rate during the period with the changes from year to year to show the correlation to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The correlation between rising unemployment and cessation of inflation is sharp, clear and dramatic. Price rises moderate generally when unemployment increases. This has been our painful experience in the past. And this is why the dilemma of the President and the Congress is so acute. Somehow we need to devise economic policies which will give us stable prices, low interest rates and low unemployment. To achieve that now when momentum for price and interest rate increases rushes ahead is extraordinarily difficult, maybe impossible.

It will take a high order of business and labor as well as presidential statesmanship to keep the increasingly important nonfiscal price pressures under control.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Cost of living, interest rates rise with fall of unemployment; rise in plant capacity use*

	Consumer Price Index <sup>1</sup>	Rate of change	Plant capacity	Rate of change (percent)	Unemployment rate	Rate of change (percent)	Prime commercial paper	Rate of change (percent)
1946	68.0		( <sup>2</sup> )		1.9		0.8	
1947	77.8	9.8	89		3.9	2.0	1.0	0.2
1948	83.8	6.0	86	-3	3.8	-1	1.4	.4
1949	83.0	-8	78	-8	5.9	2.1	1.5	.1
1950	83.8	.8	80	2	5.3	-6	1.5	0
1951	90.5	7.2	91	11	3.3	-2.0	2.2	.7
1952	92.5	2.0	90	-1	3.1	-2	2.3	.1
1953	93.2	.7	93	3	2.9	-2	2.5	.2
1954	93.6	.4	83	-10	5.6	2.7	1.6	-9
1955	93.3	-3	90	7	4.4	-1.2	2.2	.6
1956	94.7	1.4	88	-2	4.2	-2	3.3	1.1
1957	98.0	3.3	85	-3	4.3	.1	3.8	.5
1958	100.7	2.7	76	-9	6.8	2.5	2.5	-1.3
1959	101.5	.8	84	8	5.5	-1.3	4.0	1.5
1960	103.1	1.6	83	-1	5.6	.1	3.9	-1
1961	104.2	1.1	82	-1	6.7	1.1	3.0	-9
1962	105.4	1.2	86	4	5.6	-1.1	3.3	.3
1963	106.7	1.3	86		5.7	.1	3.6	.3
1964	108.1	1.4	88		5.2	-5	4.0	.4
1965	109.9	1.8	91	3	4.6	-6	4.4	.4
July 1966	113.3	3.4	93	2	4.0	-6	5.6	1.2

<sup>1</sup>1957-1959=100.

<sup>2</sup>Not Available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 2 additional minutes, in order that I may respond to his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the able senior Senator from Wisconsin for his generous references to the senior Senator from Tennessee.

I believe the Senator was just coming into the Chamber when I earlier called attention to the fact that from last August to September, the increase in the cost of living was only two-tenths of a point; from September to October, two-tenths of a point; from October to November, two-tenths of a point; then there was no increase at all through December and January. The drastic rise in interest rates that was promoted by the Federal Reserve Board—which constituted, I think, about a 37½ percent increase in Government rates—occurred in December. The cost of living jumped six-tenths of a point from January to

February; then four-tenths of a point from March to April; then six-tenths of a point from April to May; then from May to June three-tenths of a point; and from June to July four-tenths of a point.

Thus we find that for the preceding 12 months, the first 6 months show an increase of only eight-tenths of a point, but then the trend began to accelerate, and in the last 6 months we see the cost of living increasing by 2.3 points. I call this to the attention of the Senator. I realize that he has cited the case of one bill that has been requested, on which no action has been taken. But the fight against inflation will not be won easily, as the Senator has said.

The cost of living cannot be held down with a flyswatter. The pressure for increased interest rates is terrific by those who think they have never had it so good—and I do not know that they ever did. So broad-scale action is needed. What is needed most, in my opinion, is presidential will, determination and leadership. Congressional action will be required on a broad front.

But I call these facts to the attention of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin—who is one of the most learned men,

in economics and many other fields, who serve now or have ever served in the Senate—and enlist his further attention to and his further able consideration of these problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 minute to reply to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate very much the Senator's statement. While I agree that interest rates and the cost of living have risen in tandem in the last 6 months, as the Senator emphasized in his remarks, I would make two points.

No. 1 is that there is some lag between the tightness of monetary policy and the restraint that it exercises on the economy, and the effect that that policy has intending to hold prices down. The lag, I would say, is 6 or 8 months, or perhaps longer. For this reason the recent rise in interest rates could not be expected to have a simultaneous effect on prices. The effect is likely to be in the future; and even this may be offset

by other factors such as the wage-industrial-price situation.

The second point that I would make in connection with the argument of the Senator from Tennessee is that if we do follow a policy of easier money, if the Federal Reserve Board does pump more money into the economy and increase the money supply, then I do not see how we can come to any sane economic judgment under present tight economic conditions except that this is bound to increase the inflationary pressures.

Although we can make a strong case that we need lower interest rates, I think we have to recognize that there is some conflict in an inflationary period between lower interest rates and lower prices, if we try to get them both at the same time. With interest rates sharply reduced, I do not think we can make the kind of progress we ought to make in keeping prices down unless we have a very large increase in taxes, which I think would very adversely affect employment.

#### COMMITMENT PROCEDURE FOR PERSONS FOUND NOT GUILTY BY REASON OF INSANITY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when I served as U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland, I became aware of a void in Federal criminal procedure. This gap was exposed to public view through the activities of a young man who had a proclivity for flying airplanes. The only problem was that the young man had neither a pilot's license nor his own plane.

From time to time, whenever he would pass an airport, he would have an irrepressible desire to fly planes; and, with the aid of a Popular Mechanics manual, he proceeded to fly them. Fortunately, he generally landed the aircraft in one piece without inflicting injury either to himself or to innocent persons, but usually some damage was inflicted to the aircraft. On one occasion, to satisfy his desire to fly, he stole an airplane and managed to pilot it between two States.

When he was tried in the district court on a charge of wrongful interstate transportation of the aircraft, he won acquittal after psychiatric testimony disclosed that the theft occurred while the young man was acting under an irresistible impulse. It was at this point that the void in Federal criminal procedure became evident for all to see. Upon the verdict of not guilty, the young man walked from the courtroom a free man, although the testifying psychiatrists were relatively certain that his penchant for flying would soon lead to another illegal flight in a stolen aircraft. In fact, within a matter of months, the young man was again apprehended after stealing an aircraft. The danger that such activity of a mentally irresponsible person posed for the community is readily apparent.

The gap in Federal criminal law develops because there is no verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity. Federal procedure, outside the District of Columbia, merely requires the jury to find a defendant in a criminal case either guilty or not guilty. In a case where the de-

fendant produces evidence of his insanity at the time of the alleged act, the jury is instructed on the defense of insanity but its verdict does not reflect whether it believed the defendant not guilty because the evidence against him did not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he did in fact commit the act alleged or because the jury believed he lacked the mental capacity to commit a crime. The reason underlying the jury's verdict is unclear. Moreover, a man who has committed an antisocial act while insane is allowed to walk out of the courtroom a free man. There is no assurance to society that the mental illness that produced the act for which he was brought into a Federal court has been treated or sufficiently arrested to create a reasonable belief that the illness will not again produce a criminal act. Furthermore, there is no assurance that a mentally ill person will receive psychiatric help.

Mr. President, there is a need for a verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity in Federal practice, comparable to existing practice in the several States. When such a verdict is returned, there should be a determination of the acquitted person's mental condition at the time of acquittal. Any person whose mental illness has not been sufficiently arrested to assure society that further criminal behavior will not result from the illness, should be committed to a mental institution, both to insure the protection of society and to assure that the individual will receive help in his quest for sanity.

Mr. President, in order to achieve these objectives, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend chapter 313 of the United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the ground of insanity. This bill is a product of several months of study, and was drafted after consultation with a number of Federal district judges who are interested in closing the existing gap in Federal criminal procedure. These judges have written to me as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery and have cited as a prime deficiency in the Federal law the absence of a commitment procedure for persons found not guilty after the introduction of evidence of their insanity.

My bill seeks to alleviate this deficiency by establishing the verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity as one possible verdict the trier of fact can return after the issue of insanity is raised in a criminal trial. A verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity will trigger the institution of commitment proceedings against the person so acquitted of the Federal criminal charges.

The bill allows the institution of the commitment proceedings by either the U.S. attorney or the district judge who heard the criminal case. The commitment proceedings ultimately will culminate in a hearing to determine if the person acquitted because of insanity is at the time of the commitment hearing dangerous to himself or others. But prior to that hearing, the district court is given the discretionary power to com-

mit the person for psychiatric observation for a period of not to exceed 60 days. This prehearing commitment is framed in discretionary rather than mandatory terms in the bill because it is believed that in most cases where the insanity defense has been raised the person's mental condition will have been subjected to a good deal of scrutiny at the trial of the criminal charges. In these cases the criminal defendant will have undergone extensive examination and may even have been subjected to lengthy pretrial commitment either for examination or to insure that he was competent to assist his counsel in the defense of his case and thus competent to stand trial. Reported cases show as much as two or three quarter year treatments between arrest and trial. See, for example, *Fielding v. United States*, 251 F. 2d 878 (D.C. Cir. 1957).

The discretionary prehearing commitment will allow hospitalization where the court believes there has not been sufficient scrutiny of the person's present mental condition prior to and during the criminal trial. It will also allow the district judge to have the benefit of a thorough examination of the person's mental condition immediately before the hearing to determine his present dangerousness.

The bill further provides that if, after a hearing at which the person shall have the assistance of counsel, the court determines that the person, because of his insanity, would constitute a present danger to himself or others if released from custody, the court shall commit the person to the custody of the Attorney General who shall hospitalize him in a suitable mental institution. This remission to the custody of the Attorney General is patterned after provisions of existing law. Today, the Attorney General is charged with the custody of persons subjected to pretrial commitment, title 18, United States Code, section 4244, as well as with the custody of those Federal prisoners who suffer mental illness during the term of their sentences, title 18, United States Code, section 4247. The Attorney General also will be authorized by the bill to contract with State and private institutions for the hospitalization and care of the person who is still considered dangerous because of his mental condition.

The bill also insures that a person committed under its provisions will not be held beyond the time when he is a threat to society or to himself because of mental illness. This is done by preserving the right of habeas corpus, and by requiring the mental institution in which the person is maintained to make an annual report to the court which ordered the commitment on the condition of the person committed. These reports will allow the court to observe the progress of the person and to order his release if the court concludes that the danger to the community or to himself has been sufficiently arrested. The annual reports will make the committing court aware of the gravity of such commitment and will provide a basis for future consideration of the need and value of the commitment. The bill also allows the person to



be released if the medical authorities certify his improved mental condition or if the Attorney General or his representative transmits such certification to the court.

The bill, I believe, effectively fills the void that now exists in Federal criminal procedure. It attempts to strike an appropriate balance between the interests of society and the rights of the individual defendant. If it, or some modification of it which allows commitment of persons found not guilty by reason of insanity, is enacted, Federal courts will not need to be timid in adopting some modern thinking on the insanity defense. There is some evidence that the absence of an adequate commitment procedure to protect society from the automatic release of a person acquitted after the interposition of the insanity defense has been a deterrent to the adoption of a more liberal rule of criminal insanity than the M'Naghten rule. See *Wion v. United States*, 325 F. 2d 420, 428 (10th Cir. 1963); *Sauer v. United States*, 241 F. 2d 640, 650 et seq. (9th Cir. 1957). The latter opinion candidly discusses this problem. In preserving the M'Naghten rule the court stated forthrightly that, if Federal civil commitment procedures were available to "confine" a person acquitted on insanity ground, "this court might be disposed to alter its current views [on the proper insanity test]." Moreover, as the circuits adopt more liberal rules relating to the insanity defense as in *United States v. Currens*, 290 F. 2d 751 (3d Cir. 1961) and *United States v. Freeman*, 357 F. 2d 606 (2d Cir. 1966) the need for an adequate commitment procedure will become all the more pressing. Indeed, in the Freeman opinion, Judge Kaufman stated:

Effective procedures for institutionalization and treatment of criminally irresponsible are vital as an implementation of [our] decision. *Id.* at 626.

The need for legislation in this area was ably stated by the junior Senator from New York earlier this month when he introduced a bill (S. 3689) to provide for a commitment procedure. I congratulate Mr. KENNEDY for his initiative in this area. I join him in urging congressional action. As former Attorney General, he is well aware of the problems relating to the handling of persons who commit criminal acts while under the stress of mental illness. His bill would establish a reasonable commitment procedure for those acquitted of a Federal offense because of insanity. S. 3689 is similar in thesis and scope to the bill I introduce today. But there are several major differences that I will outline briefly. With two alternatives before the Senate, I believe a thorough examination of the problem will be possible.

The foremost differences relate to the criteria for commitment and the disposition of persons found dangerous. As I have stated, my bill would commit persons found, because of insanity, dangerous to themselves or others to the care of the Attorney General for hospitalization. S. 3689 would differentiate, on the one hand, between persons whose insanity made them dangerous to them-

selves and others and, on the other hand, those who are dangerous not only to themselves and others but also endanger the safety of officers, property or other interests of the United States. While the latter class of dangerous persons would remain in Federal control, the former class would be delivered to the proper State authorities.

Several possible problems come to mind as a result of this differentiation. First, I wonder if psychiatrists would be inclined to say in many cases whether the dangerous tendencies of a person stemming from a mental illness are likely to be directed particularly at Federal officers or property. Second, when a case occurs where a person is found dangerous but not to a Federal interest, his transfer to State authorities may create friction between the Federal Government and the States. After all, the person found dangerous had come to public attention because of the alleged violation of Federal law; there may have been no violation of State law. Moreover, there will have been no determination by a State court or agency that the person was or is mentally ill. In addition, the transfer of the burden to a State will not be directly accompanied by any inducement such as a Federal contract to pay for the costs of the person's hospitalization. Today, there is a reluctance on the part of State authorities to assume responsibility for persons found not guilty after a successful insanity defense where such persons do not have binding contacts with the State where the trial was held.

The reason for the differentiation between classes of dangerous persons in S. 3689 is clear; it follows the present statutory pattern of chapter 313, of title 18, United States Code, and it attempts to insure the constitutionality of any Federal commitment by allowing Federal control only of those who are clearly dangerous to the Federal Establishment. If such a differentiation is necessary to insure the constitutionality of a Federal commitment, I would endorse it, for almost any commitment procedure would be better than the present void in Federal law. However, I do not believe that it is clear that such a differentiation is necessary in order to insure constitutionality. The person found dangerous after acquittal because of insanity came to public attention through the alleged commission of what would be, but for the element of mental irresponsibility, a Federal crime. The Federal interest should be strong enough in that individual to allow Federal control of the person until his release will not endanger society. Moreover, a Federal problem, a person who allegedly committed a violation of Federal law, should not be foisted upon the States for solution.

As I have said, I believe the constitutional command in this area is far from clear. I hope that the introduction of my bill, along with S. 3689, will stimulate academic study of the problem. I am certain that the relevant Senate committee that considers the pending legislation will carefully weigh the constitutional alternatives.

Another, less substantial, difference between my bill and S. 3689 concerns the

authority to whom one committee to Federal control shall be sent. I would follow the pattern now established in chapter 313 of title 18, United States Code, and commit such persons to the Attorney General. S. 3689 would commit such persons to the Surgeon General. For the past several years an interdepartmental committee composed of representatives of the Attorney General and Surgeon General have been studying chapter 313 with the view toward a possible reallocation of responsibilities between Departments with respect to persons committed under the various procedures outlined in that chapter. I hope the interdepartmental committee will make its views known to the Senate in the near future. If the executive departments involved can agree, I would have no objection to substituting the Surgeon General for the Attorney General in sections (d), (e), (f), (h), and (i) of the bill I introduce today.

I also want to mention the work of a committee of the American Bar Foundation in the area of mental disability and the law. This able group, under the astute chairmanship of James V. Bennett, Esquire, has studied in depth the approaches of a number of States and, incidentally, the operations of the various Federal district courts within these States. I understand that the report and recommendations of this study group will not be available for publication for at least 6 months, but I look forward to their report on this problem. I am certain this group will provide valuable insights which will be of great assistance to the Senate in its consideration of my bill, of S. 3689, and of the entire scope of chapter 313 of title 18.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I highly commend the Senator from Maryland for his introduction of this bill. He has taken me back to the classroom this morning, because, as an old professor of criminal law, I recall how we used to discuss this very problem which I referred to as a serious loophole in the Federal criminal statutes.

I am regretful that, as long as I have been here, I have been guilty of a lapse in not proposing such a bill as the Senator from Maryland has proposed this morning.

If the Senator would so honor me, I would be glad to be one of the cosponsors of the bill. I am sure that other lawyers would like to cosponsor it, because lawyer after lawyer knows how right the Senator from Maryland is.

This measure is sorely needed. We are very glad to follow the leadership of the Senator from Maryland in regard to this matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I would be honored to have him as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Oregon be added as a cosponsor to my bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.



Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3753) to amend chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States solely on the ground of insanity, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3753

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"§ 4249. Commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States on the ground of insanity.

"(a) Whenever the issue of insanity at the time of the commission of an offense against the United States is raised by the pleadings or evidence, the Court shall find or, in the event of a jury trial, shall instruct that the verdict shall be one of the following: (1) guilty, (2) not guilty, or (3) not guilty by reason of insanity at the time of the commission of the offense. The judgment shall so state."

"(b) Whenever any person charged with an offense against the United States is acquitted solely on the ground that he was insane at the time of its commission, the United States Attorney, if he has reasonable cause to believe that such person so acquitted may be presently insane and that, because of his insanity, his release would constitute a danger to himself or others, shall file a motion for a judicial determination of the mental condition of such person, setting forth the grounds for such belief, in the trial court in which the proceedings which resulted in his acquittal were conducted. Upon the filing of such a motion or upon its own motion, the court shall, after notice, hold a hearing within a reasonable time to determine whether the person acquitted of an offense against the United States on the ground that he was insane at the time of its commission, would, because of his insanity, constitute a present danger to himself or others. Such person shall be entitled to be represented by counsel at such hearings, and, if such person is indigent, counsel shall be provided for him at the expense of the Government.

"(c) After the filing of a motion to determine the mental condition of a person found not guilty of an offense against the United States solely because he was insane at the time of its commission, or upon its own motion, the court may order such person to be examined by at least two qualified psychiatrists designated by the court. The psychiatrists so designated shall, within sixty days thereafter, file their reports with the court setting forth their findings with respect to such examination, including their conclusions as to the mental condition of such person and whether the release of such person would constitute a danger to himself or others. For the purpose of examination the court may order the person committed for such reasonable period as it may deter-

mine, not to exceed sixty days, to the custody of the Attorney General who shall hospitalize such person in a suitable mental institution or other facility designated by the court.

"(d) If, after the hearing provided in (b), the court shall determine that the person, because of his insanity, would constitute a present danger to himself or others if released from custody, the court shall commit the person so acquitted to the custody of the Attorney General, who shall hospitalize such person in a suitable mental institution or other facility.

"(e) Whenever a person shall be committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his representative pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, his commitment shall run until his mental condition is so improved that his release would not constitute a danger to himself or others. Upon the termination of any such commitment, the Attorney General or his authorized representative shall file with the court which made such commitment a certificate stating the termination of the commitment and the ground therefor.

"(f) Where any person has been confined by the Attorney General in a mental institution or other facility pursuant to subsection (d) of this section and the superintendent of any such mental institution or the head of any such facility certifies that, in his opinion, the release of such person will not in the reasonable future constitute a danger to himself or others and that the person is entitled to his unconditional release from such mental institution or facility, and such certificate is filed with the clerk of the court in which the person was tried, and a copy thereof served on the United States Attorney, such certificate shall be sufficient to authorize the court to order the unconditional release of the person so confined.

"(g) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude a person committed under the authority of subsection (d) of this section from establishing by a writ of habeas corpus his eligibility for release under the provisions of this section.

"(h) The superintendent of any mental institution or the head of any facility in which any person is confined by the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall annually, during the hospitalization of that person, submit to the court a written report with respect to the mental condition of such person, together with the recommendations of such superintendent or head concerning the continued hospitalization of such person. Upon the receipt thereof, the court shall consider such report and recommendations and, if it determines that his release will not in the reasonable future constitute a danger to himself or others, the court shall order his immediate release. Such reports and recommendations shall be made available to counsel in any judicial proceeding challenging the continued hospitalization of a person committed under the provisions of subsection (d).

"(i) The Attorney General is authorized to enter into contracts with the several States (including political subdivisions thereof) and private agencies under which appropriate institutions and other facilities of such States or agencies will be made available, on a reimbursable basis, for the confinement, hospitalization, care and treatment of persons committed to the custody of the Attorney General pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of this section.

"(j) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia."

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 313, title 18, United States Code, is amended by

adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"4249. Commitment of certain individuals acquitted of offenses against the United States on the ground of insanity."

## REDUCING OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, every day that goes by illustrates more clearly the importance of utilizing fiscal as well as monetary means to control inflation and reduce our continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial in the St. Louis Globe Democrat, "Reducing Our Troops in Europe."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### REDUCING OUR TROOPS IN EUROPE

Senator SYMINGTON's insistent demand that American forces in Europe be reduced as a means of stopping the drain on our balance of payments, and to check our dwindling gold supply, has found increasing acceptance in the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, is the most recent to echo this same view.

Ten years ago the United States had \$21,900,000,000 in gold reserves. Now these reserves have dwindled to \$13,500,000,000, a loss of \$8,400,000,000. At the same time other countries' gold has risen from \$14,300,000,000 to \$27,300,000,000, a gain of \$13,000,000,000.

If the United States were called upon, and we conceivably could be, to pay all of our obligations in gold, we would not have the funds to do it.

Most of the troops which Senator SYMINGTON would send home, or deploy elsewhere, are presently stationed in France where we have been summarily ordered out by Gen. De Gaulle. This is scant gratitude. From 1945 to 1966 we have given France \$9,410,000,000 in economic and military aid which accounts for a substantial portion of our global debts.

Moving our troops and dependents from France would cut this drain on our gold supply from a country where we want most not to spend American dollars in view of Gen. De Gaulle's intransigence. The resultant saving, if the troops get out of Europe instead of being shifted elsewhere on the Continent, would be reflected not only in our balance of payments, but in our strengthened military dispositions in Vietnam.

The Administration has waged a dogged fight for a continuation both of foreign aid and of substantial troop deployments far beyond our military requirements in Europe.

In the last analysis, if the Russians were ever to overrun Western Europe, they could not be stopped by American and NATO ground forces.

We have contributed up to now approximately a third of the manpower and probably 80 per cent of costs, bearing far more than our share of the burden—which primarily is Europe's rather than our own.

At the very best, our troops in France and in NATO countries must be considered as a token force rather than an effective striking force.

Since they are token, this is a chance to improve our position in many respects by following Senator SYMINGTON's and Senator MANSFIELD's advice and taking some of them out of Europe entirely.



Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in our conviction that there can be a heavy reduction of U.S. troops in Europe, the majority leader and others including myself are supported by one of the Nation's greatest citizens and most experienced military figures, former President Eisenhower. As we all know, at one time General Eisenhower was the head of the military forces of NATO.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield briefly?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Missouri for the position he has taken with respect to reducing our troops in Europe.

I agree with him wholeheartedly and believe that his position on this matter is correct.

There is no question that our having a smaller number of troops in Europe would be enormously helpful to our balance-of-payments situation. It would go a long way toward solving that problem. It would also alleviate the interest rate and inflationary problem.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was not here earlier, but am always grateful when the Senator from Wisconsin speaks on subjects incident to the welfare of the economy.

As we know, what we are all working for here on the floor, regardless of the particular way in which each of us approaches it, is the preservation of the integrity of the U.S. currency.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment on his speech?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the able Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Missouri for introducing the editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. After the morning hour I shall make a speech entitled "Our Obsolete Concepts About NATO—1949 Solution for 1966 Facts."

The speech I shall make goes along very well with the general purposes of of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I think it is time that we revise and reappraise the entire situation in Europe and find out whether it is necessary for us to keep 300,000 troops and their many dependents there or whether the balance-of-payments situation might not be aided if we review and reappraise the situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator, and look forward with interest to his planned address.

#### DISASTERS CREATED BY ACTS OF NATURE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I should like to observe that in the past couple of days the news has been replete with the recitation of the horrible conditions which have been brought about in Turkey because of another act of nature, the terrible, devastating earthquake. As a result of this disaster, thousands of people have been killed and other thousands

have been injured. Whole villages have been wiped out with all of the attendant suffering which goes with this type of act of nature.

As could be expected, and as should be expected in a time of need in other parts of the world, the United States has been quick to rush in to aid and to assist our fellow man regardless of the color of his skin or the tongue with which he speaks.

I think it is appropriate to call to the attention of the Senate that at this particular hour the United States is on the verge of having the opportunity to make a great step forward in providing better disaster relief for our own citizens.

I would like to have the record show without question that I fully support these humanitarian efforts which the United States is making in Turkey, and which it has made in Chile and other places, to help individuals in need.

Nevertheless, it is high time that the Congress of the United States go on record as establishing a policy under which we would provide more equitable and adequate treatment for our citizens when they are faced with the same kind of circumstances.

Over a year ago the Senate passed Senate bill 1861, to provide a whole vast area of additional assistance to citizens of this country when they are struck by hurricanes and tornadoes, or other disasters, as was the case on Palm Sunday when 139 people in my State of Indiana were killed in a very few minutes.

That measure was passed in the Senate without one dissenting vote. Unfortunately to this day, it has not been acted upon by the House. However, under the able leadership of some of our colleagues in the House, an executive session of one of the subcommittees of the House Committee on Public Works will be meeting to consider this matter tomorrow.

The Senator from Indiana is optimistic about the possibility that the subcommittee will act favorably upon the proposed legislation to provide more equitable assistance to those who are struck by adversity or disaster. One of the roadblocks which appears to loom on the horizon is the rather comprehensive report that has been prepared and submitted about the possibility of providing disaster insurance.

It should be said that this is a worthwhile report. It is voluminous and studies the subject in detail. But I see no reason why a comprehensive piece of proposed legislation dealing with the need for financing destroyed homes, for the construction of schools, roads, and bridges, for the repair of farm buildings and fences, and for replenishing herds that have been diminished, depleted, or destroyed by nature should be held up pending a study of the insurance proposal. The insurance program is entirely compatible with the provisions of S. 1861.

I hope that our colleagues in the House will, in their good judgment, pass the measure; additional study can be given later to the possibility of supplementing it by providing an additional insurance provision.

#### THE PROPOSED DIRKSEN PRAYER AMENDMENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the RECORD for yesterday, attention was called to the fact that the distinguished majority leader intends next Tuesday, 1 week from today, to call up the UNICEF resolution, to which the distinguished minority leader has served notice he intends to offer as an amendment his prayer amendment, which would provide for voluntary prayer in public schools.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, let me say that the subcommittee has held a week and a half of hearings on this controversial subject. I agree with the distinguished minority leader that prayer in the public schools is a highly complicated and misunderstood area, one which needs clarification. Some of the interpretations which have been placed on the Supreme Court decisions on this subject are ridiculous, to say the least.

There are those who assert that the decisions of the Supreme Court in the cases of Schempp, Vitale, and Murray rule out the singing of the last verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner" because it refers to God, and a prohibition of the singing of the last verses of "America" because they, too, refer to God. It is also claimed that it is necessary to remove from the pledge of allegiance to the flag the phrase "under God"; and also that the motto "In God We Trust" should be stricken from our coins and currency.

All these claims have no substance at all when one carefully examines the Supreme Court decisions. The Court merely held that a State governmental agency cannot prescribe a prayer to be said in a public school classroom.

I agree with the minority leader that Congress should take some action to set the record straight, try to clarify the misconceptions, and ease the burdens which rests so heavily on teachers, principals, school boards, and school administrators. But I myself question whether a constitutional amendment is the most desirable course to take.

I hope that throughout the ensuing week the Members of the Senate will give some attention to the possibility of an alternative solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. We all know that a constitutional amendment is not something to be taken lightly. It is an almost sacrosanct approach to legislation. I hope that in the ensuing week we can come up with an alternative which will clear the record, which will make it abundantly clear that the Supreme Court, the Senate and the House and, indeed, the entire country, is not godless, that we do not foster a policy that would take God out of our lives. I hope that we can arrive at



a solution which will be short of the constitutional amendment route.

In an effort to assist Senators to study the complexity of this matter, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD today some of the statements which have been made before our committee. These statements will give Senators the opportunity to analyze the position of some of our outstanding legal authorities and religious leaders, and may assist them in making a decision when they are called upon to do so a week from today.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. FREUND, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, AUGUST 1, 1966

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee to present my views as a constitutional lawyer. Since 1939 I have been a professor of law at Harvard University and as teaching principally constitutional law.

With full recognition of the high purposes that have motivated the sponsors of S.J. Res. 148 I find compelling objections to the Resolution.

*First.* To alter the Bill of Rights, and in particular the First Amendment, for the first time in our history would surely be a momentous event, justified only by some overpowering necessity that the Amendment would clearly meet. It is against these rigorous standards of necessity and clarity that the proposal should be judged.

*Second.* In many contexts there is no need for an Amendment to authorize prayer in public places. The opening prayers in the Senate, for example, and prayers at military installations, are not jeopardized by any decisions under the First Amendment. Chaplains in the armed forces are provided to fill the gap created when the government calls men and women away from their normal facilities for the religious life. As for legislative chaplains, as Mr. Justice Brennan said in the *Schempp* case, "Legislators, themselves from such public and ceremonial exercises without incurring any penalty, direct or indirect." (374 U.S. at 299-300). In the same case, Mr. Justice Goldberg, after stating that under the present decision the Court "would recognize the propriety of providing military chaplains," thus summarized the actual import of the decision:

"The pervasive religiosity and direct governmental involvement inhering in the prescription of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, during and as part of the curricular day, involving young impressionable children whose school attendance is statutorily compelled, and utilizing the prestige, power, and influence of school administration, staff, and authority, cannot realistically be termed simply accommodation, and must fall within the interdiction of the First Amendment. I find nothing in the opinion of the Court which says more than this. And, of course, today's decision does not mean that all incidents of government which import of the religious are therefore and without more banned by the strictures of the Establishment Clause."

Nor do the decisions affect the use of public buildings, streets or parks by religious groups. In fact, it is clear that if a local government permits the use of such facilities by other groups, it not only may, it must, permit similar use by religious groups. *Kunz v. New York*, 340 U.S. 290; *Sala v. New York*, 334 U.S. 558; *Cox v. New Hampshire*, 312 U.S. 569.

What is needed now is not to accept and build upon popular misapprehensions about the scope of the decisions, but to point out the baselessness of those fears.

*Third.* In the realm of the public school classroom itself, what would be the effect of the Amendment? This is far from clear. Although the distinguished proponent of the Resolution has disclaimed any purpose to overrule the actual decisions in the *Schempp* and *Murray* cases, such might well be the effect of the proposal. In the *Schempp* case the school authorities simply provided that at least ten verses from the Holy Bible should be read, on a voluntary basis (that is, with provision for exemption of objectors); in the *Murray* case the options open to the pupils were at least as wide: the reading of a chapter of the Bible and/or the Lord's Prayer. The Resolution authorizes the authorities to provide for or permit the voluntary participation in prayer, but not to prescribe its form or content. How wide or narrow an option must there be for the pupils?

If we assume that the option in *Schempp* and *Murray* was too restrictive, and that the pupils must be left without any guidance or intervention by the teacher, what will be the result? Some form of collective action will be necessary if the pupils are to know what it is that they are to participate in from day to day. It is unrealistic to expect young children to organize this exercise and select or compose prayers without some guidance. With the forced abstention of the teacher, there is an open invitation for church groups to assume this function. Then not only the philosophy of the school-prayer decisions but that of the released-time decision as well would be violated. *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203. The school system would be used not simply to promote religion but to foster sectarian purposes. The divisive effect would be increased; pupils would be divided into participants and outsiders in the planning stage, and among the participants denominational differences would be intensified by disputes over the use of the Old or New Testament, the version of the New Testament, the choice of texts, the unitarian or Trinitarian form of address, and so on. This danger of sectarianism is most pronounced where a dominant majority of the pupils in a school or a classroom are of one sect. It is in just this situation that the safeguards of the First Amendment are most essential, and it is here that the Resolution would be most damaging.

To be sure, these consequences would not occur everywhere and always; but the First Amendment is designed to avoid these dangers, and these should be clearly foreseen before we decide to weaken the guarantees against coercion in matters of religious exercise and the official fostering of a dominant creed.

What alternative consequences can be foreseen, for other schools and classrooms? One possibility is that different groups will maintain their identity but will cooperate on a kind of separate-but-equal basis, either segregating themselves for different prayer ceremonies or setting separate days of the week when each group will control the exercise. No one can look forward with satisfaction to such an intensification of religious identities; certainly one would not press for a constitutional amendment in order to bring about such divisiveness in our public schools.

A final possibility is that some greater agreement can be reached in certain schools or classes, producing a form of prayer that cannot be identified with any creedal group—what has been called a "To whom it may concern" form of prayer. This was indeed the origin of the prayer recommended by the New York Board of Regents and held invalid when prescribed on a voluntary basis in the public schools. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421. The blandness of such a prayer is only superficially a mark of acceptability. As the *Engel* case showed, and as both humanists and churchmen have testified, that kind of prayer is offensive alike to unbelievers and to the most devout of believers.

*Fourth.* There is a feeling, no doubt reflected in the Resolution, that our public schools must not be godless; that if they are, more families will send their children to private and parochial schools. If what is meant is that the atmosphere of the public schools is not theological, or creedal, or ritualistic, this is a badge of honor. Presumably what is meant is something different—that our schools should do more to promote the moral education of the young; that education must reach not only the intellect but the feelings and should strive to instill a sense of morality and reverence in the students.

To this demand there are two responses: In the first place, a brief ritual of prayer in unison in the classroom is at best a feeble and dubious recourse, a deceptively easy way to avoid the real and pressing problems of moral education in the school. As an English observer has said, the exercise is apt to be regarded as a slight irrelevance to be got over before the serious business of the day begins. But in any event, if a period of brief prayer is wanted, there is a simple way to have it: a moment of silent meditation, during which each pupil may commune either in prayer or other form of solemn thought, as his upbringing and his spirit may prompt. This would be a truer form of religious voluntarism than any schoolroom prayer in unison. Thus in a sense the whole issue comes to this: If the difference between a moment of prayer in unison and a moment of silent prayer or meditation so momentous for public education, and so plainly to the advantage of the vocal ceremony, that the extraordinary machinery of a constitutional amendment should be set in motion to achieve this alternative? The second response to the call for moral education is to point to more positive approaches in the public schools. This is the real challenge of the prayer decisions—to find methods at once less offensive in a religiously pluralist society and more effective for moral and spiritual element of a common education.

Three strands can be followed to that end, with no embarrassment from the First Amendment: teaching about religious traditions, including the heritage of religious liberty; exposure of moral issues and training in how to make moral judgments; and the creation of an atmosphere of reverence for truth and justice throughout the process of learning: reverence for what we know, humility in the face of the unknown, awe before the unknowable. These are pervasive, they can be freely shared, they do not call for special exemptions from participation, they should be inherent in the whole relation of a student to his enterprise, not an excrescence to be cultivated by a separate ritual, from which some must always be permitted to opt out. On such a foundation the home and the church can build in their private ways. With the deepest respect for the motives of the sponsors of the Resolution, I cannot help believing that the real problems of moral education, and the opportunities that beckon to meet them, are trivialized and evaded by the proposal before the Committee.

STATEMENT BY REV. DR. LEONIDAS C. CONTOS, FOR THE GREEK ARCHDIOCESE OF NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, AUGUST 2, 1966

The Greek Archdiocese acknowledges gratefully the privilege of coming once again before a distinguished committee of the U. S. Senate to make known its position in the matter of voluntary prayer in the public schools.

That position remains altogether consistent in its fundamentals as articulated both before a similar committee in the Spring of 1964, and before the General Board of the National Council of Churches a year earlier.



It is in full support of the amendment now under consideration, in the hope and expectation that the amendment constitutes an imperative corrective to the situation now prevailing.

The dilemma confronting American education issues out of the celebrated decision of the Supreme Court striking down the New York Regents' prayer; therefore, the first word perhaps ought to be spoken in this connection.

The amendment under study here, among other things, provides a very much needed reminder that the Supreme Court of the land, while supreme, and thus deserving of absolute respect, is not necessarily infallible. The amendment holds up the possibility that in interpreting the First Amendment to the Constitution, the Court may not necessarily have interpreted rightly, or even justly, the mind of its authors; nor perhaps assessed adequately the historical and cultural context within which they acted. That the Court was itself divided is proof of its healthy human fallibility. That we honor a process of review—of which I take this hearing to be a part—is proof of the vitality of our way of life.

The Supreme Court decision has been widely misread, it is true. Even though its language was careful and precise, and the scope of its findings fixed and limited, yet the effect of its decision on the New York prayer, as well as its subsequent more general judgment, was to construe the "establishment" principle of the Constitution to mean total prohibition in the public schools of any and all religious exercise. Whether this was the Court's design, it is certainly the effect of its actions.

We are convinced that this is not the sense and thrust of the First Amendment. Moreover, if the First Amendment is thus vulnerable to such an interpretation, then we are persuaded that a clear corrective is needed to liberate public school authorities from the tyranny of their present dilemma, from the fear of doing anything—even leading a prayer of thanksgiving for food—that could be attacked as unlawful. Unless such a corrective is applied to the trend so substantially accelerated by the Supreme Court's decisions, we shall as a nation have travelled irrevocably down the road to humanistic secularism.

It has been argued, indeed by members of the Court in public forum, that religion is the business of the Church and the home. It is true that Church and home have the principal role in the religious training of the young. But to declare all religious education, any reference to religious principles, as outside the broad competence and responsibility of education, is to declare, in our view, a false boundary, a mythical wall of separation, that divides, and deprives, the growing child. Moreover, it goes against the whole philosophy and ethos of this nation.

Both the Court and its supporters in this matter base their objections upon the principle of separation of Church and State. We champion this separation, but as a religious force that has survived many centuries of life under a great variety of political circumstances, including nearly half a millennium under Moslem subjugation, we are careful not to make a fetish of the separation principle. We are deeply aware of the danger of making separation a total estrangement from that religious heritage, common to us all, which underlies and undergirds the society we have fashioned.

The foundations of which our culture rests are far less sound under our feet in this present day than they might be. As a Church that has lived long and achieved a measure of human wisdom in relations with the State, we do not believe that simple judgments resolve that eternal tension between the Church and the World. It is a

part of the whole pilgrimage through history. To rob the educational system of some of its most cherished instruments—simple devotional exercises, the matchless grandeur of the Bible—is not only to impoverish that system unnecessarily, but to give comfort and refuge to its enemies.

It has been argued in defense of the prayer decisions that they did not affect the overall question of deism; they did not alter our coins or strike the name of God from every public place. That is true. But it is our concern that they may, in the minds of many, have pronounced an invitation to broaden the assault against all these.

Mr. BAYH. On succeeding days, I shall put in the RECORD other statements which will attempt to put both sides of this picture in proper perspective, so that we can deal with the matter from a factual and not an emotional standpoint.

#### WALL STREET JOURNAL SAYS PRICE PRESSURES NO LONGER INCREASING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some Senators have contended that we need a sharp tax increase because of the present economic situation; and certainly what was reported this morning in the newspapers about the cost of living rising four-tenths of 1 percent—one of the sharpest rises in 1 month that we have had—would seem to support that contention.

However, in yesterday's Wall Street Journal a front page column raised some very serious questions about the wisdom of a stringent, high-tax fiscal policy now. It argues that capacity—that is, the level at which production has been pressing plant capacity—has been steady since January, at 92 percent. It points out that unemployment is now 3.9 percent, which is higher than the percentage of February, March, or April. It is higher or as high as it has been in 6 years, since 1946.

Obviously, the implications are that if unemployment and plant capacity are stabilizing or even moderating in their pressure, this is not the time for the kind of high tax policy that could push us into a recession.

Mr. President, I might also point out that the article also shows, according to past experience, the rate of rise in the cost of living in the most recent previous similar situation, 1959 and 1960, did not stop until plant capacity utilization had dropped to 79 percent. And by present standards that would mean heavy unemployment and a real recession.

I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Government reports leave little doubt that U.S. living costs have been climbing more rapidly in recent months. The consumer price index, a widely used gauge of living-cost trends, recently has been rising at an annual rate of more than 3%, nearly three times the yearly gain that prevailed in 1960-65. In the view of many economists, the

current rate of increase constitutes worrisome inflation.

Whether living costs continue to move up so rapidly, of course, depends in part on a variety of imponderables, ranging from the course of events in Vietnam to President Johnson's willingness to pursue more restrictive economic policies in an election year. A somewhat encouraging suggestion of what may lie ahead, however, may be glimpsed from some of the yardsticks that indicate what is happening to the amount of growing room, or slack, in the economy.

For many months before living costs began to rise more rapidly, these yardsticks showed the slack was fast disappearing in the economy—a development not unrelated to the recent price trend. Now, however, this seems no longer to be the case. The current picture indicates that the amount of slack still remaining in the economy, while small, at least no longer is shrinking.

The change can be detected, for instance, in statistics that record the portion of unused capacity in U.S. factories. The percentage had been shriveling. But recently it has remained approximately constant. Since the first of the year, according to Government estimates, manufacturers have been using roughly 92% of their total plant capacity.

Admittedly, this factory operating rate continues at what many analysts feel is an uncomfortably high level, and there is little indication of a significant reduction any time soon. Still, the rate at least appears to have stopped climbing—and is leveling off, it is noteworthy, at a percentage appreciably below the post-World War II high of 96%, reached in early 1953.

This leveling off is in marked contrast to the trend in recent years. As recently as 1961, at the start of the current economic expansion, the operating rate stood at only 78% of capacity, a full 14 percentage points below this year's level.

A similar development has taken place on the labor front. In July, after seasonal adjustment, the labor-force unemployment rate stood at 3.9%. This is down very slightly from the 4% levels of May and June, but actually is higher than the jobless rates in February, March and April. As recently as April, the unemployment rate was only 3.7%. For the first seven months of 1966, the jobless rate averaged 3.9%, precisely equal to the latest figure.

The 1966 record is very different from the pattern earlier. In 1961, the unemployment rate was 6.7%. As the expansion has progressed, the rate has declined, sporadically at first, then steadily. Between January 1964 and December 1965, the rate declined with almost monthly regularity; it fell from 5.6% at the beginning of 1964 to 4.1% at the end of last year.

Within the overall labor picture, it should be added, the job category that includes only married men with families actually has shown less sign of strain recently. This key category contains most of the nation's breadwinners and skilled workers who form the backbone of the labor force. The overall jobless rate, of course, also includes many part-time workers, such as many teen-agers and housewives.

This rate for married men, seasonally adjusted, rose in July to 2% from 1.9% in June and 1.8% in May. July marked the first time since last November that the rate has been as high as 2%.

Again, the recent record differs markedly from the past trend. In the course of last year, for instance, unemployment among married men fell from 2.7% to 1.8%. As recently as early 1963, the rate was near the 4% mark.

The unemployment levels in recent months, to be sure, do not suggest any considerable slack in the nation's reserve of manpower. However, it should be noted, the



overall July unemployment rate of 3.9% by no means approaches any sort of record low. In the postwar era, unemployment has been as low as 2.9%, the 1953 average. In fact, in six of the years since World War II, the average unemployment rate has been as low as or lower than the recent 3.9% level.

There are, of course, many considerations that will determine the trend of prices in coming months, besides the purely physical limits of the nation's men and machines. Evidence that the strain on factory and human resources is no longer increasing, however, suggests that the living-cost outlook may not be quite so worrisome as it may seem at first glance.

Certainly, there is little in the recent record to indicate that the current price climb will slow significantly. Business history suggests that any actual slowdown in the rise of prices very likely must await more slack in the economy.

For instance, the rise of the consumer price index in the last economic expansion, in 1960-61, did not begin to slow appreciably until the final quarter of 1960. By then, the factory operating rate had dropped to 79% from 1960's first-quarter level of 87%. The price index, by no coincidence, did not begin to rise appreciably again until the latter part of 1961, when the rebounding operating rate was approaching 85%.

However, the record of recent months also provides an indication, albeit tenuous, that a further acceleration in the rise of living costs is perhaps unlikely in coming months. And such a prospect is certainly welcome at a time where there is widespread and increasing concern about the possibility of spiraling inflation.

—ALFRED L. MALABRE, JR.

#### PRESENT VIETNAM POLICY NOT THAT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CLARK. The morning papers refer to a statement made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday in a way which very much surprises me.

The headline in the Washington Post reads, "Viet Policy Also J.F.K.'s, Rusk Says." In an article under the byline of Homer Bigart in the New York Times this morning, the statement is made:

He—

Meaning Dean Rusk—

implied that had President Kennedy lived, American combat troops would be as heavily committed in Vietnam as they are under President Johnson.

An AP dispatch is also published this morning under the headline, "Salinger Says J.F.K. Viet Policy Probably Would Match L.B.J." This sudden effort to join the late President Kennedy in the responsibility for the American involvement in Vietnam today I find most unfortunate. It is quite out of line with what was stated by Mr. Arthur Schlesinger in his authoritative book on President Kennedy's administration, entitled "A Thousand Days." In addition, it is entirely out of line with what President Kennedy said 2 months before his death. I quote his comments which he made in September 1963:

In the final analysis it's their war—they're the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it.

It has now become our war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, speaking only for myself, and without having any way of knowing what our late and much beloved President Kennedy would have done under these circumstances, I believe he would have stuck to what he said in September 1963.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am familiar with the quotation to which the Senator referred. It is taken from one of President Kennedy's news conferences in the closing days of his administration.

I think we may add to that a presumption, because no one can say exactly what President Kennedy would have done. But I think it is fair to assume he would have carried out the implications of the quotation which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] cited. But also I believe his experience in the Bay of Pigs fiasco would have greatly disillusioned him with the military advice he had been getting in that unfortunate situation, and would have been reluctant again to follow such misguided advice as has been given by Secretary McNamara, who at various times has made forecasts about Vietnam which have proved totally erroneous.

President Kennedy had that bitter experience in the Bay of Pigs, with military advisers, the CIA, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff all giving him the very mistaken advice which resulted in the Bay of Pigs incident.

I am certain that President Kennedy would have learned by that experience and would not have followed their advice in South Vietnam.

#### THE McCLOSKEY CONTRACTS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, yesterday on the Senate floor the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made some remarks about the General Services Administration's handling of the contract awards for the Philadelphia Mint. It was particularly interesting to learn how the General Services Administration handled the bid of McCloskey & Co. It was indeed alarming to me to note that McCloskey & Co. would receive what, on the surface, appears to be favored treatment. Yesterday I made some remarks concerning Senator WILLIAMS' statement and my thoughts suggesting that this was a scandalous way in which to handle our Government contracts. I suggest that perhaps the Senate should consider looking into the procedures involved.

Yesterday I referred to the fact that, on one hand, our Government is suing the McCloskey Co. for \$5 million because of the Government's contention that the McCloskey Co. was negligent in the performance of its contract to build the Boston Veterans' Administration Hospital and thus poor construction resulted in

the loss of the exterior wall which had to be rebuilt. Our Government, on the other hand, improperly, in my opinion, is entering into new contracts with the same company for the construction of the \$12 million mint at Philadelphia. This does not make sense.

We could not expect any reasonable man to deal with a company that had treated him as the McCloskey firm has treated the U.S. Government.

On July 19, I entered in the RECORD a letter I wrote to Mr. Lawson B. Knotts, Jr., Administrator of the General Services Administration, questioning the award to the McCloskey firm. That letter appears on page 16135 of the July 19 RECORD. In fairness to Mr. Knott, and to inform all Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD Mr. Knott's response, dated August 2.

Mr. President, I also asked to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. Clark is responding to my letter of July 26, wherein I asked to be brought up to date on the status of the McCloskey suit and to know what the allegations were. I think Senators will find it interesting to see how the Department of Justice looks upon the McCloskey firm and how the General Services Administration looks upon it. I think this situation deserves immediate Senate attention.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1966.

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: Reference is made to your letter of July 19, 1966, concerning award of the contract for construction of the new U.S. Mint in Philadelphia to the firm of McCloskey & Co., Inc., and suggesting that McCloskey & Co., Inc., be precluded from further Government contracts and denied the Mint contract.

As you know, debarment is a severe penalty which can easily destroy a going business, inasmuch as debarment by one Government agency is grounds for similar action by others. Consequently, the requirements of Constitutional "due process" have necessitated the erection of procedural safeguards against abuse and limitations upon the power of contracting agencies to impose such a sanction. The Federal Procurement Regulations reflect these considerations and are specific as to matters that constitute grounds for debarment.

In this instance, we have no evidence, with respect to any of the matters to which you allude in your letter, to support a debarment. The mere fact that a civil action has been instituted against the McCloskey firm in connection with the Veterans Administration hospital in Boston is not sufficient evidence, in and of itself, upon which to base so drastic an action as debarment.

Quite apart from the foregoing, we must also mention that the McCloskey firm's record of performance under contracts with the General Services Administration has been satisfactory. Among the more recent contracts performed for GSA by McCloskey & Co., Inc., was the construction of Federal Office building No. 6, a \$10,000,000 project. McCloskey has also satisfactorily completed the contract for construction of the substructure of the new Mint. Against this factually documented record of satisfactory



contract performance, we would be acting prematurely if we were to base a debarment or finding of nonresponsibility on a matter that is being litigated.

Please be assured that we share your concern in safeguarding the national interest in the selection of Government contractors.

Sincerely yours,

LAWSON B. KNOTT, Jr.  
Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1966.

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: Your letter to the Attorney General bearing the date of July 26, 1966 and relating to McCloskey & Company has been referred to me for reply. Suit against McCloskey & Company is being tried in Boston before the Federal District Court. A Special Master was appointed by the Court and hearings were held from March 30, 1966 until June 10, 1966. They will resume on August 16, 1966, and based on present progress it is not anticipated that they will conclude for several months, or that a decision of the District Court will be issued before the summer or fall of 1967.

The Government's complaint alleges that on February 15, 1950 the Government entered into a contract with McCloskey & Company for the construction of a hospital at a contract price of \$10,563,000, the hospital to be constructed in accordance with drawings, plans and specifications prepared by a joint venture composed of Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott, a partnership and Charles T. Main, Inc., a corporation; that the Government entered into a contract with the Architect-Engineer whereby said Architect-Engineer agreed to furnish a resident engineer and other inspection personnel to supervise construction for the purpose of assuring compliance by McCloskey with the approved drawings and specifications; that construction of the hospital began on or about May 27, 1950 and was completed on or about June, 1952; that about June of 1953 the outer brick wall began to spall, bulge, crack and loosen and that this condition continued; that in 1961 an exploratory contract was entered into with a firm of consulting engineers, Weiskopf and Pickworth, and that based in part on their recommendations the Government determined in 1962 that there were so many unauthorized departures from the contract plans and specifications by McCloskey & Company and failures by the Architect-Engineer properly to inspect and supervise McCloskey's contract performance that local repairs were not sufficient and that it was necessary to remove and replace the brick outer wall and windows and to construct a new frame to support the new outer wall; that the defects and deficiencies consisted in part of the misalignment of concrete columns, of the failure to install some relieving angles used to support the brick work, of the failure to install in many places metal ties and anchors which tie the outer brick wall to the inner concrete frame; that the cause of the failure described was the negligence of McCloskey & Company in the performance of the construction contract and the negligent performance by the Architect-Engineer of the inspection contract; that the Government has been damaged in the approximate sum of \$5 million.

The files of the Department reflect but one other action against McCloskey & Company. In this action it appears that the Government was assigned an account receivable in the approximate amount of \$21,000, owed by McCloskey & Company. However, McCloskey & Company paid a materialman creditor of the assignor a sum in excess of \$21,000, and under the Miller Act was

discharged of its debt to the assignor. In short, the assignee (the United States) was subordinated to the materialman. Hence, it is expected that this action will be dismissed in the near future.

The pending criminal indictment against Mr. Baker does not involve allegations concerning Mr. McCloskey or McCloskey & Company.

Sincerely,

RAMSEY CLARK,  
Deputy Attorney General.

### THE BACKTRACKERS

MR. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Backtrackers," which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 11, 1966.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

#### THE BACKTRACKERS

And so it seems that the "track" system in the D.C. public schools is on the way out.

The new members of the School Board, having voted down a proposal to add a fifth track for pupils who have fallen far behind their contemporaries, may now be expected to succeed in eliminating the track system altogether.

Well, so be it.

Our own position has been made clear many times. We have felt that the institution of the track system by Superintendent Carl Hansen—after he had presided over the peaceful integration process here—was a wise move. We felt that this system provided for at least a partial solution to two major problems, namely, making it possible for relatively deprived pupils to trade up scholastically, while, at the same time, giving more gifted pupils the opportunity to proceed at a rate equal to their abilities.

We still feel that way. We still feel that any society has this dual obligation. It cannot overlook the needs of the previously deprived. Equally, it must not inhibit those who are born equipped to become intellectual leaders.

Let's not delude ourselves about this. All men are not created intellectually equal. We shall be doing a major disservice to the future if we believe otherwise.

Such men as Albert Einstein and Ralph Bunche seldom appear among us. To presume that all of us can, with equal opportunity, equal them is to subscribe to the veriest nonsense.

We believe that the track system, for all its manifest insufficiencies, is aimed at making it possible for each pupil to proceed toward his maximum intellectual potential at his own best pace. We have always agreed that the track system was less than adequate, but also that, by trial and error, it could and would be improved to the extent that any system, involving so many individuals, could approach perfection.

However, as we have noted, the track system appears to be doomed, to be replaced by a system of "team teaching" and ungraded elementary classes for the more backward pupils. At this writing, the anti-trackers on the School Board appear to be rather nebulous in their thinking. They speak of "innovations" and that's about it.

We believe innovations are fine, but let's make certain where they lead before we put them into effect.

The lessons of the Head Start program should not be overlooked. The Head Start idea was, and is, splendid, but it began, and, to an extent, has continued, with little planning and scant teacher training. Better that we should have studied what has been

learned elsewhere about pre-school teaching—especially in Scandinavia—before we plunged into something we knew practically nothing about.

We hope, then, that the newly constituted School Board will make haste slowly in eliminating the track system. We hope that the members will bear in mind the ancient aphorism: "Don't trade something for nothing."

Incidentally, and quite by the by, in this city where citizens are rightfully concerned about the educational facilities available to the current generation, we call attention to a graphic exposition of just what's on tap here. We refer to the window displays at Woodward & Lothrop's downtown store. We urge Washingtonians to take a tour around them. We believe they'll be surprised—and proud—of what has been accomplished up to now.

### THE DONABLE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM—HEARINGS

MR. METCALF. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to extremely important hearings which are being held in the House this week. I refer to the hearings of the Donable Surplus Property Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. The subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative MONAGAN, of Connecticut, is seeking to evaluate the donable surplus property program which I discussed briefly yesterday. May I repeat that I consider this program to be a very valuable one, in giving much needed property to deserving schools and hospitals.

Mr. President, Chairman MONAGAN said at his hearing this morning that he wanted to demonstrate the dedication of the Congress of the United States to the donable surplus property program. The Senate has demonstrated its dedication to that program by passing S. 2610. I was happy to participate in the hearings which led to the writing of the bill and also to join as cosponsor with Senator GRUENING who introduced the legislation. The bill was assured passage by the expeditious work of the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Under S. 2610, the first priority for Government surplus property goes to possible utilization in some agency of the Federal Government—"further Federal utilization." So we first make sure that no property that could profitably be used in Government is given up. After this, however, the top priority goes to donation under the donable surplus property program for use in schools and hospitals. It is right that in a humane society, education and health should have high priority. Finally, if the property cannot be used by either the Federal Government or by schools and hospitals, it may be sold. This is the outline of S. 2610 which I hope will be passed soon by the House.

One subject being examined by the Monagan subcommittee is a recent General Services Administration directive which redefines the categories of property which can be sold or exchanged for new property. The Defense Department on August 10 announced its compliance with this directive, although many people—including Chairman MONAGAN—



have voiced their concern that the donable program may be harmed by the new policy. In view of this concern, the Senate action on S. 2610, and the present House hearings, I ask that the Defense Department stop sales of surplus property until Congress has expressed its intent on this matter.

The Congress of the United States has many times reaffirmed its dedication to the donable program, and will constantly be alert to any administrative regulations which would weaken the program. I know that many of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress will join me in my determination to see that this fine program is maintained and strengthened.

#### ALL ASIAN PEACE CONFERENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, more and more American boys are daily risking their lives in their effort to protect the Republic of South Vietnam from Communist slavery.

This is the unavoidable price a nation of freemen must pay to preserve freedom.

We are in Vietnam with a purpose and we are there with a right. Our purpose is to preserve the freedom of 14 million human beings in that land and our right is the right of all freemen to protect that which they cherish and hold dear.

But let us never lose sight of the reason for our fight in Vietnam. Let us never become so concerned with the waging of war that we forget that its object is peace; a just and honorable peace.

Mr. President, I hope we will carefully examine every avenue leading toward such a peace in Vietnam. I do not speak here of a peace which appeases the enemy and only whets his appetite for more and larger conquests. I trust that we have learned the lesson of that folly.

I speak instead of a peace that guarantees the freedom of the 14 million people of South Vietnam; a peace which guarantees the protection of the concept of individual freedom for which Americans have fought and died all over this globe.

A constructive suggestion has been brought forth on this floor by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. He has focused the attention of this body on a proposal to examine the feasibility of an all-Asian conference to try to find an equitable solution to the conflict in Vietnam. The idea is that the Asian nations are directly concerned with the war and know best the problems of southeast Asia and their possible solutions.

Such a conference just might open the door to a cessation of the fighting in Vietnam.

We must back our men in Vietnam because their lives and our security depend upon it. We must stand firm there because the freedom of the people of southeast Asia depends upon it. But if there is another way to protect the freedom of the people of southeast Asia, a way less costly in terms of American lives, Mr. President, we must seize upon it.

We can leave no stone unturned in our search for an honorable solution to the Vietnamese problem and we can leave no

stone unturned in our search to find a way to lessen the toll of American lives lost in solving that problem.

Therefore, I hope the United States can give the closest attention and consideration to the proposal for an all-Asian conference. Let us apply new and imaginative thinking to this situation.

The freedom of the people of South Vietnam and the American lives buying that freedom demand that we do so.

#### SCHOOL MILK AS IMPORTANT AS OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the budget for fiscal 1967 proposes to spend \$219.9 million on oceanography. These funds will be spent, if appropriated, on oceanographic research and survey programs. Yet last year the administration spent only \$100 million to provide milk for the Nation's young under the special milk program for schoolchildren.

Now I do not intend to criticize the various oceanography programs of the Federal Government. However, I do feel that the health of the young people of our Nation is at least as important. If we can afford to spend almost \$220 million for oceanography, we can afford to spend at least half that amount to see that our children receive milk.

The Senate has appropriated \$105 million for the school milk program. Past statistics would indicate that even this amount, if it is accepted by the House, would be inadequate to provide full Federal reimbursement for half pints of milk at the prior maximum level. Consequently I intend to fight for adequate funds in a supplemental appropriation bill before Congress adjourns this year.

#### PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of our country, termed with affection "the Bill of Rights," were adopted on the demand of men who had won the Revolutionary War.

The first amendment guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religious beliefs. It is the cornerstone of every American's freedom of conscience.

The amendment proposed by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] to permit voluntary prayers in schools, if adopted, would severely infringe upon freedom of religious belief. While I share with the junior Senator from Illinois and with most Americans our common American heritage of religious traditions and a personal religious faith, I also believe in the wisdom of those who framed our Bill of Rights and in the correctness of the interpretation by the Supreme Court of the first amendment with regard to prayers in public schools.

The place for prayers is in the home and in the church. Every American has the constitutionally guaranteed right to worship as he pleases, and not to worship if he pleases. He can pray at home, at church, on the job—in short anywhere. However, to authorize prayers as part of

the public school routine is to inject the state into this private matter of conscience and belief.

Public school prayers could never be truly voluntary. There would always be pressure on school pupils to conform. The first amendment to the Constitution should not be amended or tampered with. I will never vote to weaken our inherited doctrine of absolute separation of church and state. When we weaken the Bill of Rights in one respect, then other precious rights such as the right of fair trial, freedom from compulsory self-incrimination and from unreasonable search and seizure might be next in order to be destroyed.

Mr. President there appeared an excellent editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer on August 4, 1966, entitled "Prayers in the Public Schools." I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PRAYERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments this week began formal hearings on Sen. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN's amendment to undo the U.S. Supreme Court's work in connection with prayers in the nation's public schools.

Like Senator DIRKSEN's other amendment on the subject of apportionment of the state legislatures, the so-called prayer amendment is designed to redefine what most Americans regarded as the unquestioned status quo before the Supreme Court acted.

The specific court decisions that would be undone by the amendment are two:

In the case of *Engel vs. Vitale* in 1962, the Supreme Court held in a 6-1 decision that the use of a prayer composed by New York State officials and required to be recited aloud by students at the beginning of the school day constituted a violation of the First Amendment. Even the fact that the prayer was designed to be "neutral" as far as the various religious denominations were concerned did not affect its unconstitutionality.

In the twin cases of *Abington Township vs. Schempp* and *Murray vs. Curlett* a year later, the court held in an 8-1 decision that a Pennsylvania law requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Bible at the beginning of the school day and a similar law in Maryland were also a violation of the First Amendment. The fact that objecting students could be excused from participation made no difference to the court.

In both cases, the sole dissenter was Justice Potter Stewart, formerly of Cincinnati.

Most Americans will recall the nationwide debate that accompanied both decisions. The anger that generated the debate stemmed not so much from the importance of public school prayers in themselves as from the conviction among many Americans that they were somehow being pushed around. They felt, in most cases, that the two decisions pleased only a tiny segment of the nation—in some respects the least "religious" segment. And they pointed to the nation's rich religious heritage as evidence that the Supreme Court was indeed misinterpreting the intent of the Constitution's framers.

As emotions have cooled, more and more Americans have become less indignant. Religious leaders in particular have tended to uphold the court—a circumstance that bodes ill for what Senator DIRKSEN's amendment seeks to accomplish.



The National Council of Churches maintains that the leadership of 93% of the nation's 56 million Protestants are firmly opposed to the Dirksen amendment. Jewish groups are also opposed. And among the nation's Catholic bishops, opinion is so divided that the Catholic church will probably take no stand at all.

What support the Dirksen amendment enjoys—and it is considerable nonetheless—comes from rank-and-file church-goers who feel that the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1963 amount to a denial of God.

Even though we did not welcome those decisions, we are inclined to feel that the Dirksen amendment should not be passed. We have frequently spoken in this space of the vital importance of religion in American life. But we question whether the public school system is the proper apparatus for nurturing the religious spirit in America. In too many instances—and religion is only one—American parents have tended to foist off on the schools more and more of the responsibilities that are properly theirs. The effect of the Supreme Court rulings was to put the religious responsibility back where it belongs—in the laps of the parents. Should the Dirksen amendment find its way into the Constitution, many parents would feel once more that they had disposed of that responsibility.

Conscientious parents, we think, have nothing to fear from the status quo.

#### COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a number of students of the collective-bargaining process—men who are committed to that process and want to see it work with maximum effectiveness—have quite correctly been concerned by the occasional breakdown of that process, or the development of tendencies which seem to prevent its functioning the way we had hoped it might.

It seems to me, therefore, quite heartening to observe sincere effort to make collective bargaining work in the Nation's tremendously important and sensitive communications system. I believe that both the union involved, the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO, and the management of the Western Electric Co., a division of the Bell System, deserve commendation for their efforts to date to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement.

Perhaps they will not do so. I hope they will. But I think that, whatever transpires in the next few days, we can appreciate the affirmative and untiring effort that has gone into this particular set of collective-bargaining negotiations.

First of all, there has been real bargaining. There have been union proposals and company counterproposals. Neither side, apparently, has felt it necessary to crystallize its position into hard-and-fast attitudes that are not susceptible of easy solution.

Second, the Communications Workers did not come into the Western Electric negotiations with a take-it-or-leave-it attitude. It had no pat formula; it sought improvements on a number of issues, but on each of these issues it proposed discussion and examination—in other words, collective bargaining.

Third, the union did not feel that it was necessary to involve the Government in the collective bargaining process.

CWA has given us, I believe, a highly commendable example of the method by which a free and democratic union seeks to achieve its objectives at a national company without reliance on governmental power.

Fourth, I believe that CWA deserves praise for going to the public with its story. It has not sought to bargain with Western Electric through the press; that would be unwise and hurtful to the chance of getting agreement. But CWA has not hesitated to take its philosophy—about collective bargaining, about guidelines, about its general objectives—to the general public.

All of this I find a most commendable posture by CWA. It is a union whose national and local leaders have done much to earn a reputation for responsibility and for a sense of obligation not just to their own members but to the entire community, local and national.

I have no facts upon which to make any judgments about the actual content of the collective bargaining discussions between CWA and Western Electric. Without specific facts, I do not know what is a fair wage increase figure, or what should be done specifically about vacations or holidays or pensions or health plans for Western Electric employees.

But it seems to me signally encouraging that a major trade union and a major communications company have been trying to make collective bargaining work, with a minimum of histrionics, or name calling, or public airing of the details of their negotiation efforts. For this effort, CWA and Western Electric management deserve congratulations from the public, from the labor movement, from forward-looking management.

Let us hope that this collective bargaining process, undertaken here with mutual respect and a sense of the economic realities, will eventually come to a sensible, practical conclusion and agreement between American labor and management. The public deserves this reminder that collective bargaining can work, and work well, on a national scale.

#### DALLAS NEWS ADVOCATES SAVING PART OF BIG THICKET

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texas is richly endowed with lands of varied terrain and great natural beauty. One of these areas is the Big Thicket of east Texas which is now threatened with destruction by industrial development. Big Thicket covers about 2,000 square miles and contains a unique combination of plant and animal life. Two thousand classified trees, plants, and shrubs, and hundreds of animals dwell within Big Thicket. The area is a haven for biologists and botanists for the study of rare vegetation and wildlife.

For many years I have advocated the creation of a national park in a portion of Big Thicket. I have visited Big Thicket and have seen some of the variety of plant and animal life it contains. There is great value in the preservation of some untouched lands for recreation

and enjoyment of future generations. Big Thicket is being attacked by commercial developers; its beauty is being eroded by special industrial interests. If untamed land is to exist in the future, we must take steps today to insure its survival.

An editorial which appeared in the Dallas News on August 13, urged that part of the Big Thicket be preserved as a park before this unusual territory is transformed into an industrial wasteland. I ask that serious consideration be given the Big Thicket as a potential national park and request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the fine editorial from the Dallas News of August 13, "Let's Save the Thicket."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LET'S SAVE THE THICKET

Deep in East Texas, the last few of the many Indians who once roamed this region live on a small reservation. Around them is some of the last virgin timber, the untamed tangle of growth known as the Big Thicket.

That maze of trees and brush is threatened with extinction by commercial firms and developers. Fifty acres a day are disappearing, say members of the Big Thicket Association who hope to arouse Texans to the value of preserving a portion of this attractive, unspoiled region. Their proposal is backed by Texas Parks and Wildlife Commission.

Mayor Dempsey Henley of Liberty, president of the Big Thicket Association, hopes that 15,000 acres can be saved in a chain of parks to give Texans of the future an opportunity to see the varied plant life of the region. Preservation of the plants would also keep alive squirrels, wood ducks, deer, alligators and other wildlife.

Timber companies will donate much of the land, park proponents say, and the remaining acreage could be purchased by the state at a relatively low cost. But costs will increase and the dense vegetation that can be saved will disappear unless Texans act soon.

Demands of urbanizing Texas constantly pile up costs for the state government and it is hard for parks to compete with the other pressing needs. Nevertheless, saving a peaceful place of refuge from the noise and tensions of urban life is a good investment, one that will grow in value to Texans as their numbers increase.

#### RIISING IMPORTS OF BEEF

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, during the month of June the volume of imports of foreign fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal and mutton into this country amounted to 100.2 million pounds of meat.

Importation of this volume of meat represented a sharp increase from monthly average imports during the previous 5 months of this year. It was the first time this year that monthly imports had exceeded 100 million pounds. In fact, it was the greatest volume of imports in any one month since enactment of Public Law 88-482, the 1964 meat import control law.

Imports at the rate of 100 million pounds a month are practically double the average rate of monthly imports experienced last year, when the monthly



average was 51 million pounds. If imports should continue for the rest of the year at the monthly rate of 100 million pounds, the total for this year would come to 977 million pounds, just barely less than the record imports of 1963, which amounted to 1,048 million pounds.

American cattlemen, both producers and feeders, are understandably concerned at this sudden increase in imports. In 1963, when the quantity of imports reached the climax of a period of steady increases, the floor fell out from under American cattle markets. Prices fell as much as 30 percent on some classes and grades of cattle. The industry went through its most severe and prolonged period of suffering since the end of World War II. In an effort to ease that suffering in some degree, Congress enacted Public Law 88-482, which authorized the imposition of quota limitations on the quantities of beef, veal and mutton permitted to be imported from foreign sources.

The level of domestic cattle prices has not yet been seriously affected by this sudden spurt in the tonnage of beef imports, nor is it my intention to suggest that it is likely to be. However, it does seem worthwhile to take a look at the exercise of the delegation of authority contained in Public Law 88-482 on the part of the executive branch.

The statute provides that each 3 months the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate the quantity likely to be imported of beef, veal, and mutton of the types specified in the law. If this quantity of expected imports is greater than the amount established by a statistical formula written into the statute, the President is directed by the law to proclaim a limit on the quantities of such meats that will be admitted during that year, except under certain extraordinary conditions.

In accordance with the law, therefore, Secretary Freeman estimated on December 30 of 1965 that imports of the meats defined in the statute would amount to 700 million pounds. On that basis he announced that such a volume of expected imports was not sufficiently great to require the imposition of quotas, according to the formula established in the statute.

However, on April 1 of 1966 he revised this estimate upward, to the figure of 760 million pounds. Then, on June 10, he again revised upward the estimate of expected imports, to a figure of 800 million pounds.

In other words, it is apparent that his first estimates were too low. In fact, the estimate of 800 million pounds of imports was made before he had available to him the figure on the record volume of imports during June of 100.2 million pounds.

It is evident that the rate of imports is increasing faster than had been expected, and it is quite likely that if the Secretary were today preparing a formal estimate of imports for the full year 1966, he would come out with a higher figure than 800 million pounds.

The statute instructs the Secretary to prepare these estimates each quarter year, but it does not tell him he cannot do so more frequently than quarterly.

In view of the startling volume of meat imports during June, it is my suggestion that he review his most recent estimate for the full year, and perhaps revise it once again. If the time comes to impose quotas, we would want to be prepared to act promptly.

Secondly, in my judgment the Secretary's public announcements of his determinations under Public 88-482 are less than fully candid and informative. It is requested that a copy of his press release of June 10 announcing his most recent estimate of 1966 imports be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

**MR. HRUSKA.** Mr. President, this announcement is more notable for what it omits to say, than for what it actually does say.

In his announcement for example, the Secretary gives an estimate for imports of 800 million pounds for 1966, as stated earlier. Yet nowhere is it mentioned that imports have been increasing faster than expected, or that this estimate represents a considerable increase over the earlier estimate of 700 million pounds. Nor is there any comparison made between the amount estimated as imports for the full year—800 million pounds—and the quantity of imports actually recorded up to the time of the announcement, so that the reader may judge for himself the accuracy of the Secretary's estimate.

In fact, nowhere among the many statistical publications of the Department of Agriculture is there any publication in timely fashion of the figure representing imports of the meats covered by Public Law 88-482, on which the imposition of quotas must be based. That figure can only be secured by special inquiry of the Department.

Public Law 88-482 provides that the base quota for imports shall be 725.4 million pounds, but then provides that this base quota shall be adjusted according to the increase in domestic commercial production since the period 1959 through 1963. In his press announcement the Secretary carefully announces that the adjusted base quota for 1966 is 890.1 million, and that the so-called trigger for the imposition of quotas is now 979.1 million pounds, without ever mentioning that we are thereby permitting vastly greater quantities of meat to be imported before quotas are imposed, than during the base period. The statutory base quota is not even mentioned in the press release, nor is there any explanation of the manner in which the adjusted base quota is estimated.

In his press release of June 10 of this year, the Secretary did, however, remember to mention that prices received by farmers for cattle averaged \$23 per 100 pounds, higher than a year earlier. Apparently he considered that to be an argument against the imposition of quotas.

Since the date of that press release, however, according to the statistical publications of his own Department, the average price received by farmers for beef cattle declined from \$23 per hun-

dredweight on May 15 to \$21.80 on July 15. Furthermore, it is not true that cattle prices this year are better than they were last year. According to the Livestock-Meat-Wool Market News of August 16, the average price of Choice fed steers in Chicago was \$25.78 per hundred pounds during the week ended August 11 of 1966, compared with \$27.06 during the corresponding week of the previous year. In other words, prices declined by more than \$1.25 per hundred during that year.

**MR. PRESIDENT,** it is my fervent hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow the provisions of Public Law 88-482 faithfully and accurately, and will not be reluctant to advise the President to impose quotas on imports if conditions so require.

**MR. PRESIDENT,** I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter by me to the Secretary under date of August 19 dealing with some of these points be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

#### EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, June 10, 1966.

#### MEAT IMPORT ESTIMATES IN CALENDAR 1966 CONTINUE BELOW QUOTA REQUIREMENT LEVEL

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today said that revised estimates of meat imports into the United States during 1966 place the expected total at about 800 million pounds.

He indicated this quantity would not require Presidential action to invoke meat import quotas for 1966 at this time.

Under legislation (P.L. 88-482) enacted in August 1964, if yearly imports of certain meats—primarily beef and veal—are estimated to equal or exceed 110 percent of an adjusted base quota, the President is required to invoke a quota on meat imports. The adjusted base quota for 1966 is 890.1 million pounds. The level of estimated imports which would trigger its imposition is 110 percent of the adjusted base quota, or 979.1 million pounds.

Secretary Freeman said the estimate of fresh, chilled or frozen cattle meat and meat of goats and sheep, other than lamb, which will be imported is based on detailed surveys of trade and other information. He pointed out that the expected volume on meat imports compares with actual imports of 614 million pounds in 1965, 740 million in 1964, and 1,048 million in 1963. It is 10.1 percent below the adjusted base quota, and 18.3 percent below the estimated volume required to trigger its imposition.

The Secretary noted that prices to farmers and ranchers in the U.S. are currently averaging 23 dollars cwt., or 10 percent higher than last year. He expressed confidence that prices over the balance of 1966 would average above those of 1965.

Pursuant to the law, the Department will continue to make quarterly determinations of import prospects to advise the President of any changes that may occur, Secretary Freeman said.

#### EXHIBIT 2

AUGUST 19, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the month of June of this year the quantity of imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, and mutton amounted to 100.2 million pounds,



That figure represents a very sharp increase as compared with the previous rate of monthly imports. During 1965 imports averaged about 50 million pounds per month. During 1966 imports by months were as follows:

	Million pounds
January -----	51
February -----	60
March -----	49
April -----	63
May -----	52
June -----	100

From January to May the monthly average was between 55 and 60 million pounds. Thus, June imports represent very nearly double the monthly average of the previous months.

If during the remainder of this year imports from foreign countries continue to flood in at the same rate as in June—100 million pounds per month—the total for 1966 would come to 977 million pounds, only a little below the record imports of the year 1963 of painful memory, when they amounted to more than a billion pounds.

In your implementation of Public Law 88-482, the meat import quota law, it is required that you make periodic forecasts of the quantities of imports. It is noted that last December you estimated that imports for 1966 would come to only 700 million pounds. In March of this year, you revised that estimate upward to a figure of 760 million pounds, and in June again upward to 800 million pounds. Even this last estimate, it is understood, was made prior to the time when you had knowledge of the extremely heavy imports experienced in June.

You are aware of the concern felt by American cattlemen at the danger our markets might again be flooded with seemingly unlimited quantities of foreign beef. The cruel suffering experienced by American producers and feeders during the 1963-64 price debacle makes that concern understandable.

In view of the sharp upward leap in the volume of imports during June, we might be well advised to redouble our precautions against a recurrence of that disastrous experience.

The purpose of this letter is to make two specific suggestions.

First, it is suggested that you review (and if necessary revise upward) your forecast of the expected volume of imports for the rest of this year.

In June you estimated 800 million pounds for the year. Undoubtedly the June imports of 100.2 million pounds were more than you expected. Perhaps your estimate for the rest of the year is also low.

Although the statute requires you to make a forecast only once each quarter, there is no law forbidding you to do it more often. Frankly, in view of the surge of imports during June, it is my fear that the foreign beef might flood in even more sharply during the coming months than any of us previously expected. You would want to be prepared to impose quota limitations on imports promptly if necessary.

Secondly, it is necessary to question the manner in which data on meat imports, permissible quotas and "trigger points," domestic commercial production, etc., are made public by the Department of Agriculture.

The meat quota legislation, Public Law 88-482, sets forth a formula for the imposition of quotas on foreign meat. Yet among all the statistical publications of your Department, nowhere are there published the operative figures called for by that formula, at least not until many months after the fact. That is, nowhere are there published monthly the figures on imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, and mutton. Certain figures on imports are published, it

is true, but not in such form that they can be used to determine the imports of meat dealt with by Public Law 88-482.

Also, the figure on estimated "domestic commercial production" as defined in the statute is not published in timely fashion. Nor is there any description of the manner of calculating the "adjusted base quota" referred to in your press releases, as compared with the base quota of 725,400,000 pounds stated in the statute.

In other words, the public is simply not given the facts needed to follow or judge your application of the quota legislation. Most of the figures used earlier in this letter were obtained from the Department only by my special request. Apparently they are all readily available within the Department, but the information is carefully kept there seemingly under wraps. When an alarming increase in the imports of the types of meats dealt with by P.L. 88-482 occurs, the public is not made aware of that fact by any publication or action of the Department of Agriculture.

A policy of candor on your part would be more becoming. In my judgment, it is a part of your obligation as the cabinet officer responsible for the implementation of this law to publish promptly each month in some departmental publication the figure on monthly imports of the types of meat covered by the potential quotas provided for by P.L. 88-482. This should be done in such form as to permit the public to follow the course of imports along with the departmental experts, and to make its own judgments on the impact of such imports, and on the manner in which the law is being carried out.

It is recognized that you were not originally in sympathy with the enactment of this law and that you formerly defended the agreements with Australia, New Zealand, and other countries calling for a much higher level of imports.

However, it may be that we are closer to the day when these quotas will be imposed than you wish to admit. Also, it may be that at that time you will be thankful to have this quota power available to protect our markets. It is hoped that you will see fit to adopt the two suggestions given above, so that this legislation may be enforced in the most beneficial manner.

Sincerely,

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
U.S. Senator, Nebraska.

#### THE FAMILY FARM AND THE FUTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, after we enacted a 4-year Federal farm bill last year, it may have been logical to expect that 1966 would be a relatively quiet year in the discussion of agricultural policy. As Members of Congress are well aware, however, Federal actions affecting farm prices and the supply of farm commodities have been very much in the spotlight this year.

Perhaps the greatest significance of the current discourse is its scope. Farm prices, while of direct and paramount concern to farmers, are usually—and unfortunately—of only passing interest to consumers and to the public in general. This year, however, several factors have combined to focus the interest of millions of Americans on the state of the Nation's agriculture.

The surpluses which we have cursed—but which we have also depended on—are all but gone. At the same time we have begun to recognize and are preparing to use the full potential of our farmers' productive capacity as an instrument

of economic and social progress in other parts of the world. While in the midst of these developments, the American public has been exploring the basic relationship that exists—or should exist—between farm prices and food costs.

I believe that this discussion is of vital importance to farmers, because it should help the American public to understand that parity farm prices are not only valuable to the family farmer, but are also desirable from the standpoint of the consumer and the Nation as a whole. As more and more people take this basic reality into account when they formulate their attitudes toward Federal farm policies, I believe the painfully slow rate of progress toward fair returns for agriculture can be quickened.

In a recent "Rural Life Day" address in Chaska, Minn., the president of the Independent Bankers Association of America, Mr. Pat DuBois, described the urgency with which he and his organization feel this Nation should be viewing the farm economy:

It is plain to see—

He says—

that every American has a vital stake in agriculture, and in the economic well-being of the family farm and the rural community serving the farmer.

Mr. DuBois has supplied an eloquent and incisive discussion of the numerous reasons why we need a strong family farm system of agriculture. I believe his remarks will be a valuable contribution to the current debate over Federal farm policies, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE FAMILY FARM AND THE FUTURE

(An address by Pat DuBois, president, Independent Bankers Association of America, and of First State Bank, Sauk Centre, at the fifth annual Rural Life Day, Archdiocese of St. Paul, Sunday, Aug. 7, 1966, Chaska, Minn.)

The farmer has a loyal and true friend in the National Catholic Rural Life Conference with which your Saint Paul rural life department is affiliated.

And I am proud to count among my friends two of its outstanding leaders, Monsignor George Webber of Des Moines and Father James Vizzard of Washington, D.C. They are staunch defenders of the family farm, and the farm family in America.

In this year 1966, we do not state anything new when we say the farmer deserves a fair return. Those of you who may have gone to Mass last Tuesday heard the Epistle which Saint Paul wrote to Timothy more than eighteen hundred years ago. He put it in these plain words: "The farmer who does the cultivating ought to have the first share of the crops."

A good many of us here today are residents of rural America and therefore deeply concerned about the survival of our rural communities. Now, and for more than ten years, the farmer has been hampered by a selling price too low for an adequate return on his production.

Because I have spent most of my life in a small town, I will try to picture the outlook for the family farm in the light of economic, social and political factors that influence our rural society and bear on developments ahead.



This is a fast-moving, complex era, and the fight for survival of the family farm and the rural community that serves the farmer is a very real struggle indeed.

Perhaps I should begin with a story from real life to highlight the problem and show that it will take the best that is in us, all working together, to better the farmer's chance of succeeding today.

This is the story of a family which is still living on a 312-acre farm that did produce dairy products. The land is good, and the facilities were fair. There were 45 milk cows in the herd, and the management and labor were furnished by the senior farmer and his son-in-law, both dedicated and knowledgeable operators.

For years, they worked hard to get their farm on a paying basis. They waged an uphill battle aggravated by higher operating costs, expense of replacing farm machinery, and the added burden of crops reduced by lack of moisture or unfavorable season.

At the same time, the prices for the commodities they sold remained below the level of an adequate return. The family finally threw in the towel and auctioned off their personal property last year. And the younger partner, now 38 years old, has entered college to prepare himself for employment as a teacher.

I would guess that many of you have had to turn to off-farm employment to make ends meet, or to save your family farm. Now what are the reasons for this, and what can we possibly do about changing things for the better?

My perspective is that of a country banker doing business on America's typical and original "Main Street" at Sauk Centre. I am also a member of the Minnesota Legislature and president of the Independent Bankers Association of America which has six thousand four hundred members, all but a few of them country banks serving farmer customers.

Basic to our association is the conviction that the independent bank that is of, by and for the community, must continue to be a strong and active element in the continued growth and prosperity of our nation.

If the communities which support the independent banks of this country are no longer needed to serve the people of rural America, a role these banks have filled so well for so long, then the America we know today would be a totally different and much less desirable place to live.

Vital to the survival of our rural communities is a local economic climate that will permit our rural people to prosper.

The future of literally thousands of rural communities—and incidentally of thousands of our independent banks—will depend on retention of the family farm through adequate prices for agricultural production.

Agriculture is the economic keystone of rural America and of our organization of medium size and smaller banks. To indicate the vital stake our association has in the future of rural America, I need only to tell you that half of the member banks in our association are located in towns of 2,000 or less. Nearly 4,000 member banks who comprise two-thirds of our association, serve communities of 5,000 or less.

Farmers, ranchers and residents of rural communities serving the farms and ranches are the customers of an overwhelming majority of those banks in our association which has its national headquarters in Sauk Centre.

It is evident, then, that if the small town does not survive, neither will independent banking.

One of our association's basic objectives, therefore, is to work vigorously in behalf of the rural economy. For a number of years, our association has carried on an intensive

campaign to secure a fair price structure for agricultural production.

Members of our Agriculture-Rural American Committee have testified before Congress on legislation affecting rural America. We have worked closely with the farm organizations and farm-oriented church groups on behalf of the family farm and the rural community.

During our recent annual convention, we adopted a strong resolution declaring that a prosperous agriculture is essential to continued prosperity in the total American economy. We said the agricultural segment has for 15 years been the sacrificial lamb while other economic segments prospered literally at the farmer's expense.

We warned that the resources of rural America, both human and financial, are being depleted at an alarming rate, chiefly because of an unfair price structure on agricultural commodities.

We admonished that the rural community and its independent banks and businesses might not survive unless agricultural prices are brought into relative balance with other segments of the economy.

We urged that for the economic well-being of all Americans, the Federal Administration should stop trying to force down agricultural prices, and that instead, agriculture should be permitted a fair price for its production in relative balance with prices permitted other segments of the economy.

We define the family farm as a farm unit that is a home-owned family enterprise which provides employment to a farm family. The size of the farm operation and the land acres involved must be sufficient to utilize the energies, knowledge and skills of the farm family and provide for a reasonable economic opportunity under adequate and fair prices from the farm's production.

The family farm can be highly specialized on limited acreage or a diversified operation with considerable land, or a grain farming operation which utilizes many acres. The family farm can be a ranch with limited high productive acres or a large grazing operation, and in each case, the knowledge, skills and physical energy are supplied by the family.

The family farm operation can rightfully grow as the family matures and the children are able to provide a greater portion of the necessary work. The growth might be in added acres or expanded operation, or in many cases, both.

The family farm inculcates civic virtues and fosters strengths and substance that are valuable to the health and vigor of our nation. It inspires a pride of ownership and a sense of responsibility to the community.

The farm family is an integral unit of rural society, the backbone of the rural community, because it supplies stability and the continuity of people abiding on the land.

Farming people comprise a reliable and resident labor force. And the family farm is an admirable human enterprise in which each family member shares.

But this fine unit of society in rural America has some pressing and specific needs:

1. Family discipline and dedication to the farm operation.
2. Good and capable management of the family farm itself.
3. Strong farm organizations functioning both in marketing and political areas, with informed, dedicated and capable leadership.
4. Fair and adequate prices for its production, parity in the marketplace.
5. Sophisticated advice and assistance on production and marketing.
6. Adequate capital with proper and reasonable terms.
7. Cooperation and assistance from other family farm units.

In today's society, a poorly managed or marginal family farm will not long exist. Modern day competition from properly man-

aged family farms and from corporate farming enterprises will be too great.

We believe that the years ahead do hold opportunity for people living in the rural areas, but the degree of opportunity will depend largely on how adequate are the prices paid for agricultural commodities. If the farmer is to prosper and share in the so-called Great Society, he must be allowed to earn a profit in keeping with the profit opportunity available in other areas of the economy.

Since 1952, we have experienced a decline in our agricultural economy largely brought on by underpayment for agricultural production. The family farm during this long period has been denied an economic opportunity equal to that afforded other segments of our economy.

For some, this meant selling and leaving the farm. For others, it meant deterioration of farm facilities and farm operations as they reduced the pattern to match the reduced available income.

To many who have survived and are today on family farms, it has meant increased debt as the farmer borrowed to provide the improvement and updating of facilities for the expansion necessary to compete.

Today it appears we are turning the corner. Prices are improved. Available supplies of farm commodities have been greatly reduced and the present diminished food reserve causes considerable concern to our government. It seems to me that our ability to consume, supported by the great needs of the hungry people of the world, provide reason for further price improvement.

Credit is due the U.S. Department of Agriculture for administering the farm programs that have brought supply and demand into closer alignment. The U.S.D.A. acknowledges that agriculture is not an island separate from the national interest, and considers the two basic goals of American farm policy are: better incomes for farmers, and balanced abundance for consumers.

The U.S.D.A. claims the farm economy is healthier today than anyone could have anticipated six years ago.

Realized net farm income in 1965 totaled \$14.1 billion, \$2.4 billion more than in 1960, a better than 20 percent gain in five years.

The Economic Research Service now estimates the total net farm income for 1966 at \$15.7 billion, up \$1.5 billion from 1965 and up \$4 billion over 1960, to the highest level in history except the postwar years of 1947 and 1948.

Net realized income per farm which averaged \$2,956 in 1960 rose to nearly \$4,210 last year and is expected to reach \$4,785 in 1966, a 60 percent increase in six years.

Income from all sources per person on farms rose from \$1,108 in 1960 to \$1,510 in 1965. The estimate for 1966 is about \$1,600, roughly 44 percent more than in 1960.

The U.S.D.A. reports that the income gap between farm and nonfarm people is narrowing. In 1960, people on farms earned only 55 percent as much as nonfarm people. This year they will earn 65 percent as much as nonfarm people. The income gap this year between the two will be narrower than at any time in more than 30 years, save in 1948.

While this is a trend in the right direction, the U.S.D.A. concedes that the farmer still is deplorably underpaid. Also, weather conditions and other regional or local factors have prevented some farmers from sharing in the improved national farm income.

The U.S.D.A. sums up the farm income picture as follows, and I quote it for you:

"This increasingly favorable income situation has been brought about by many factors:

"Farm programs have helped greatly in lightening the heavy burden of enormous grain surpluses that were keeping prices depressed. The growth in world markets, stem-



ming in part from U.S.D.A. export development activities, has also helped immensely. And the effect of a prolonged period of prosperity in the national economy cannot be overestimated. But the most fundamental cause has been the effort of the farmers themselves."

In spite of these improvements, and with the exception of hogs, soy beans and apples, not a single agricultural commodity is obtaining a parity price.

Let's look at the record for our own state of Minnesota. Based on 1965 figures, Minnesota ranks first in the production of oats, creamery butter manufacturer, and nonfat dry milk manufacturer.

Minnesota ranks fourth in corn grown for grain, and fifth in hog marketings. But the parity price for oats in May, 1966 is reported at 86.6 cents while the average farm price received by farmers is reported at 65½ cents.

Parity price for corn in May was \$1.58, but the average farm price was only \$1.19. May parity price for hogs was \$22.70 while the farm gate price was reported at \$22.30. Hogs now are selling above parity, but for how long?

Parity for milkfat in cream was 82.9 cents per pound, but the farmer received only 62.6 cents. Parity for milk, wholesale, was \$5.76 per hundred but the farmer received only \$4.33.

Also for May, 1966, beef cattle parity prices are reported at \$27.10 per hundred-weight. But the farmer and rancher were receiving a gate price of only \$23.

These figures are evidence that agriculture has been and is still caught in a cost-price squeeze.

Production costs are up \$550 million a year, and the prices on some commodities have not improved enough to offset the added costs.

Debt service alone will take an additional \$400 million a year which the present increase in net farm income is too small to cover. The unearned portion must be met by adding cost of debt to existing debt, or by liquidation of assets to pay the debt.

Despite recent price gains, agriculture still is in a bind. It appears that a cash deficit in funds needed to pay all costs and claims will be about \$500 million this year.

The United States Department of Agriculture paints a too-rosy picture of our agricultural economy. We must look at census figures to see more clearly what is taking place in rural America.

The nation's farms suffered a population loss of 3.2 million persons in six years between 1960 and 1966. The number of farms dropped from four million to 3.3 million, a loss of 663,000 farms in the same period.

And why? People leave the farm because opportunity is lacking instead of knocking—a lack largely due to underpayment for farm output over many years.

Our rural communities and the service industries in them exist mainly to serve the needs of agriculture. As we lose farm families, of course the need for the rural community as it has existed will cease, and its people will migrate to the cities and industrial centers.

If we eliminate the family farm, projected migration of about 45 million people from rural areas to the cities will occur during the years 1966 to 2000. And if this happens, the rural population will decline from 28 per cent to about 12 per cent of the United States population by the year 2000.

Farm population that was 18 per cent in 1945 will drop from its present level, 6½ per cent of total population, down to one-half of one per cent.

America's rural problem is really a problem of depletion—depletion of agriculture, of rural towns and trade, of politics and culture.

And in Minnesota with 118,835 farms and a total farm population of 504,000 out of the state's total population of about 3,500,000, the farm population has dwindled to one-seventh of the total state figure.

From this information, it is easy to see that the American farmer is no longer a powerful political force.

Now more than ever it behooves farm people to join together in farm organizations—organizations with as much numerical strength as possible; organizations with dedicated, capable leaders, and directed toward improving farming conditions both social and economic.

Leadership in the farm organizations must be aggressive and strong, unselfish toward self perpetuation of individuals as leaders, and dedicated to the accomplishment of farm goals.

Isn't it time for the American farmer to concentrate his efforts in one or two farm organizations with the strength of numbers and a clearly defined program for advancing the necessary goals, whether it be a free running supply-and-demand, or supply management, or collective bargaining? You must decide, if you are to benefit from organization.

We who are in farming and business in rural America must recognize the changing pattern of rural communities and prepare to adjust our operation every so often to meet changing needs of our agricultural economy.

The opportunity for success for the farmer, the rural merchant and the banker will in the long run be measured by the level of agricultural prices when stacked up against farm costs.

No miracle will occur that will provide a sudden, easy victory in the fight for survival in rural America. If the family farm and the rural community on which it relies are to survive, all of us must constantly strive for a healthy local economic climate and proper ground rules under which we function.

We are convinced that if the urbanization trend continues, and the rural communities do not survive, America will lose one of its greatest assets, an asset that has traditionally helped this nation grow and realize its potential. There is an almost tangible attractiveness of rural America that tugs upon city dwellers. Life in our smaller communities is freer, roomier, brighter, safer, cleaner, healthier.

Our rural communities can survive, and they must! Armed with a fair and adequate price for what they produce, our farmers and ranchers will not have to abandon the land. With more income in the hands of our rural people, opportunities in our small towns will improve. Family farms and their communities will be assured of an economic climate conducive to their survival.

I believe there will be great opportunity for people in rural America. I believe we will hold our people in the rural communities, and with an improved environment and job opportunities, we will reverse the process of migration from rural America.

Our association has been warning the Congress and top administration officials of the need for urgent action that will improve the income of the farmer and reverse the exodus from the land.

We suggest that injustice to the farmer in the marketplace acts as a powerful drag on the entire economy. But more than the health of our nation's economy is at stake.

America's urban areas are not able to absorb the dislocated who must move to the cities when jobs and a chance for decent family living fade in rural America. Sociological problems that deeply worry our government are being aggravated by further

migration to already congested metropolitan areas.

And our nation's capacity for producing food and fibre as weapons for peace and to sustain less fortunate millions in underdeveloped and famine-racked lands is being eroded by flight from the farms of rural America.

The United Church minister in our town announced the other day that a missionary from his church confided an eye-witness report on hunger today in drought-ridden India. Mothers of infants, he said, search the dung of cattle in the ditches to salvage undigested food to keep their children alive.

Robert M. Koch, executive director of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, said in Washington last month that American agricultural production is a major tool in the World War against Hunger.

Until self-help programs advance to the point where developing nations manage to do the major part of the big job of supplying enough to feed their people, American agriculture will be the one sustaining force that staves off starvation.

Mr. Koch also recognized that the American farmer must have the proper safeguards of his income if he is to fill his role in this life-or-death worldwide endeavor. He declared:

"We must not allow the American Farmer to produce for world peace and then have his tremendous efficiency boomerang against him in the marketplace. The Committee on the World Food Crisis will fight for a well-balanced program, not just for American farmers, and not just for hungry people in certain areas, but for a WORLD WAR on hunger, geared as far as humanly possible to the needs of all involved in this great effort."

There is an alternative to rural poverty, and that is for all interested groups including farmer organizations, churches, business and banker organizations and Congress to act together, and insist that the farmer is compensated fairly for his output.

The United States Senate in June unanimously passed a concurrent resolution introduced by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN of South Dakota, with 41 other Senators, one of which was Minnesota's Senator MONDALE, as co-sponsors, that would direct all agencies of the federal government to let farm prices rise to full parity.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture believes that the present upward trend in farm income should be encouraged in every way possible, because farm prices still hover substantially below parity, and per capita farm income remains inequitably low.

In mid-May, farm prices were 79 per cent of parity, and the latest available data reveals that per capita farm income is only 55 per cent of the per capita income of the non-farm population.

Lower farm prices and higher marketing charges pushed the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar down from 49¢ to 39¢ in the 16 years from 1949 to 1965.

In 1965, farm prices averaged 77 per cent of parity. Had they been at 100 percent of parity, the farm value of the food purchased by consumers would have equaled only about 6.8 per cent of disposable personal income.

With the increase in this income now in prospect for 1966, and if farm prices rise to full parity, consumers would pay only 6½ percent of their income for farm-produced foods, less than in any year in the past ten.

Senator MCGOVERN reported the farmer's share of disposable personal income for food has dropped from 11 percent to 5.3 percent in the past 18 years. Yet it would take only 6½ percent to pay farmers for food at full parity prices. The increase, a little over one per cent of disposable income, would be



money well spent to assure a sound, stable, agriculture and an even keel for our economy.

Much more to be deplored would be the skyrocketing food prices that might result from shortages of food items caused by the sort of liquidation of productive capacity that is going on in dairying today. Farmers have been selling their herds for a simple economic reason: milk production has not been a paying proposition for them.

The decimation of cows is causing a shortage in both milk and beef while demand for dairy and beef products is steadily increasing. Cattlemen have reported a drop of 2.7 million heifers in the first five months of 1966. Total number of cows and heifers killed in the first five months of this year is about 5.3 million, a good 25 per cent more than the kill in each of the liquidation years of 1955 and 1956.

This seems to foretell a severe shortage of dairy and beef cattle, and, a sustained period of boom for producers who can hold on.

The support price for factory milk was increased 50c to \$4 per hundredweight in the support program recently announced, the highest support in the history of the dairy pricing program, and it comes on the heels of a 26-cent increase previously announced for the current output.

The U.S.D.A. is setting the minimum basic formula price for figuring the producer prices on fluid milk to reflect the \$4 factory milk support. And the new basis will be applied to all markets, depending on local formulas. The new program boosts support for butterfat from 62.6 cents to 68 cents per pound. And Secretary Freeman may ask Congress for incentive payments next winter.

This action by the U.S.D.A. is largely the result of their concern for an adequate supply for dairy products for the consumer. For the first time in many years, we are in danger of not producing enough to meet the demand, and it is hoped that improved government support price and possible incentives will be a factor bringing about increased production.

Many agricultural reporting services are optimistic in their prediction of price improvement suggesting new highs for agricultural commodities, and we share their enthusiasm, but also warn that feed and farm operating costs will continue to increase and will require close observation to protect profit margins.

Even if the fighting stops in Vietnam, it would have little effect on the commodity price outlook. Peacetime supply-demand factors, not war, are providing the power behind the prices. The government will try hard to slash the prices whenever it can. While the administration policy purportedly supports higher prices for the farmers, the government keeps a watchful eye on the interest of the consumers who are much more numerous. Officials tactfully explain there is a limit as to how high the prices for farmers should go. The overall aim is to produce supplies that are adequate at reasonable prices.

In our nation's involvement in global missions to alleviate human suffering and to establish world peace, the American farmer and his ability to produce vital food and fibre for many more than himself are an ace in the hole, a trump card, a powerful instrument for peace that is held in reserve.

Secretary Orville Freeman declared in a Minneapolis speech not long ago:

"The American farmer holds the key to whether there will be time enough to avoid world disaster. A large measure of hope for peace in the world depends upon his ability to furnish food for restless, hungry people—to buy time while scientists and agricultural technicians of our own country and other advanced nations teach the under-developed regions to produce more for their own needs."

Farm exports for cash will be nearly five billion dollars in the current fiscal year, compared with \$2.5 billion just seven years ago.

It is plain to see that every American has a vital stake in agriculture, and in the economic well-being of the family farm and the rural community serving the farmer.

This nation simply cannot endure the withering of its vital member, the segment of its population residing in rural America. And every American wherever he lives has a stake in a strong and aggressive agriculture that goes beyond the food on his daily table.

The American farmer is finally being recognized for what he really is—an indispensable man in struggles to encourage world peace, to lick famine and sustain orderly governments in developing nations, and to support the integrity of the dollar by leveling off our deficit in the international balance of payments.

America's future hinges in a very real way on what is done to, and for the farmer, and the rural business community to which he looks for services. And we who know this have the obligation of communicating our concern to our government and our fellow Americans.

We have to tell them plainly we want them to quit making the farmer the fall-guy for prospering by all other segments of our economy.

We ask for him only what he justly deserves for his investment, his labor, his risk and his know-how. He wants not a single dollar more, but he must not settle for a penny less than a fair return.

#### PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR CO-OPERATION WITH SWEDEN AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to the Joint Committee a proposed amendment to the existing civil agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Government of Israel, and a proposed new agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy between the United States and the Government of Sweden. The proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Sweden was received by the Joint Committee on August 4, 1966. The proposed amendment to the agreement for cooperation with the Government of Israel was received on August 19, 1966.

The proposed new agreement with the Government of Sweden supersedes the agreement between these two parties which was signed on January 18, 1956, as well as the amendments thereto. The purpose of the new 30-year agreement with the Government of Sweden is to provide a means of assuring a long-term supply of enriched uranium fuel required by Sweden for its projected nuclear power program. The agreement would reflect changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, permitting private ownership of special nuclear materials by enabling private parties in the United States and

Sweden to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. A feature of the new agreement with Sweden is that it would provide for the transfer of safeguards responsibility to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The proposed agreement would increase the maximum quantity of uranium 235 that could be transferred to Sweden from the limit under the present agreement which is 400 kilograms to a limit of 50,000 kilograms specified in the proposed new agreement.

The proposed amendment to the agreement with the Government of Israel would raise from 10 to 40 kilograms the net quantity of uranium 235 which may be transferred to Israel for fueling of research reactors. In addition there would be provision for the transfer of material enriched to more than 20 percent in the uranium 235 isotope when a technical or economic justification for such a transfer exists. Additionally the amendment to the agreement with Israel would reflect recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Israel to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material.

Section 123(c) of the act requires that these proposed agreements lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while Congress is in session before becoming effective. It is the general practice of the Joint Committee to publish proposed civil agreements for cooperation in the Record and to hold public hearings thereon.

In keeping with this practice, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of the new agreement and the proposed amendment to the existing agreement together with supporting correspondence.

There being no objection, the text of the new agreement and the proposed amendment to the existing agreement together with supporting correspondence were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1966.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

a. an executed superseding "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden";

b. a copy of the letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the Agreement; and

c. a copy of the letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that performance of the Agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the Amendment and authorizing its execution.

The Agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would supersede the research type Agreement between the



United States of America and the Government of Sweden which was signed at Washington on January 18, 1956, as amended.

The primary reasons for entering into a power Agreement with the Government of Sweden are to provide the framework for assuring the long-term supply of enriched uranium fuel required for the projected Swedish nuclear power program and to provide for the transfer of safeguards responsibility to the IAEA, by incorporating in Article XI of the proposed Agreement the provision that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards in the Agreement.

The proposed Agreement, which would have a term of thirty years, would reflect changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear materials by enabling private parties in the United States and Sweden to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Arrangements made directly between private parties under the proposed Article VI would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies and license requirements of the Government of the United States and Sweden.

Article VII of the proposed Agreement would provide for the sale of enriched uranium required for the long-term Swedish power reactor program described in the Appendix to the Agreement and would increase the maximum quantity of U-235 that could be transferred to Sweden, either on the basis of sale or toll enrichment, from the present limit of 400 kilograms to 50,000 kilograms.

Performance by the Commission of uranium enrichment services after December 31, 1968, for the account of the Government of Sweden under conditions which the Commission may establish would be permitted by Article VII. In addition, the Commission would be able, at its discretion, to make available to the Government of Sweden uranium enriched to more than twenty percent in the isotope U-235 when there is an economic or technical justification for such a transfer.

Article IX of the proposed Agreement contains reciprocal guarantees by the Government of Sweden and the Government of the United States with respect to atomic weapons or other military use of materials, equipment and devices covered by the Agreement. The guarantee by the Government of the United States is similar to that contained in the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and Switzerland and, insofar as materials are concerned, would extend to (a) special nuclear material not owned by the Government of the United States which is produced through the use of special nuclear materials obtained from the United States which is in excess of Swedish needs and which the United States decides to purchase and (b) special nuclear material produced in United States-leased fuel which the United States elects to retain after it has been reprocessed, or alternatively, to equivalent amounts of such purchased or retained material.

The new Agreement will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for entry into force.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,  
*Chairman.*

#### Enclosures:

1. Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden (3).
2. Letter from the Commission to the President (3).
3. Letter from the President to the Commission (3).

#### AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SWEDEN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden signed an "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy" on January 18, 1956, which was amended by the Agreement signed on August 3, 1956, the Agreement signed on April 25, 1958, and the Agreement signed on July 20, 1962; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden desire to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy, including the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors and research reactors, and the exchange of information relating to the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden are desirous of entering into this Agreement to cooperate with each other to attain the above objectives; and

Whereas the Parties desire this Agreement to supersede the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy" signed on January 18, 1956, as amended;

The Parties agree as follows:

#### ARTICLE I

The "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy", signed on January 18, 1956, as amended, is superseded on the date this Agreement enters into force.

#### ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this Agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the Parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the uses of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. Restricted Data shall not be communicated under this Agreement and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred, and no services shall be furnished, under this Agreement, if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of Restricted Data.

C. This Agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the Parties are not permitted to communicate.

#### ARTICLE III

Subject to the provisions of Article II, the Parties shall exchange unclassified information with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses and the problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this Article shall be accomplished through various means including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities, and shall include information in the following fields:

- (1) Development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, materials testing, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors;
- (2) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of the types of reactors listed in subparagraph (1) above; and
- (3) The use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

#### ARTICLE IV

A. Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information, as provided in Article III and subject to the provisions of Article II, including special nuclear materials for purposes other than fueling reactors and reactor experiments, source materials, heavy water, by-product materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes may be transferred between the Parties for defined applications in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not commercially available.

B. Subject to the provisions of Article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the Parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available when such facilities are not commercially available.

C. With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in Article III and subject to the provisions of Article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one Party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfers will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

#### ARTICLE V

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) and any material, equipment, and devices exchanged or transferred between the Parties under this Agreement, shall be the responsibility of the Party receiving it, and the other Party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information, material, equipment, and devices for any particular use or application.

#### ARTICLE VI

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article III, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices, and for the performance of services. Such arrangements shall be subject to the limitations in Articles II and VIII.

#### ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this Agreement, the United States Commission will transfer to the Government of Sweden, under such terms and conditions as the Parties may agree, uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 for use in the fueling of defined research applications, including research reactors, materials testing reactors, reactor experiments, and reactor prototypes, as the Commission may agree to upon request of the Government of Sweden.

B. In addition, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of Sweden under such terms and conditions as the Parties may agree, all of Sweden's requirements for uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 for use in the power reactor program described in the Appendix to this Agreement, which Appendix, subject to the quantity limitation established in Article VIII, may be amended from time to time by mutual consent without modification of this Agreement.

C. The Commission may also transfer to the Government of Sweden, under such terms and conditions as the Parties may agree, special nuclear material for the performance in Sweden of conversion or fabrication services, or both, and for subsequent transfer to a nation or group of nations with



which the Government of the United States of America has an Agreement for Cooperation within the scope of which such subsequent transfer falls.

D. The United States Commission is also prepared, to such extent and under such conditions as it may establish, to enter into contracts to provide after December 31, 1968, for the production or enrichment, or both, in facilities owned by the Commission, of special nuclear material for the account of the Government of Sweden for the uses specified in paragraphs A, B and C of this Article.

E. With respect to transfers of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 provided for in paragraphs A, B, C and D of this Article, it is understood that:

(1) contracts specifying quantities, enrichments, delivery schedules and other terms and conditions of supply or service will be executed on a timely basis between the United States Commission and the Government of Sweden, and

(2) prices for uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 sold or for services performed and the advance notice required for delivery will be those in effect at the time of delivery for users in the United States. The United States Commission may agree to supply enriched uranium or perform enrichment services upon shorter notice, subject to assessment of such surcharge to the usual base price as the United States Commission may consider reasonable to cover abnormal production costs incurred by the United States Commission by reason of such shorter notice.

F. It is agreed that, should the total quantity of enriched uranium which the United States Commission has agreed to provide pursuant to this and other Agreements for Cooperation reach the maximum quantity of enriched uranium which the Commission has available for such purposes, and should the Government of Sweden not have executed contracts covering the adjusted net quantity specified in Article VIII, the Commission may request, upon appropriate notice, that the Government of Sweden execute contracts for all or any part of such enriched uranium as is not then under contract. It is understood that, should the Government of Sweden not execute contracts in accordance with a request by the Commission hereunder, the Commission shall be relieved of all obligations to the Government of Sweden with respect to the enriched uranium for which contracts have been so requested.

G. The enriched uranium supplied hereunder may contain up to twenty per cent (20%) in the isotope U-235. The Commission, however, may make available a portion of the enriched uranium supplied hereunder as material containing more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

H. It is understood, unless otherwise agreed, that in order to assure the availability of the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated hereunder for a particular reactor project described in the Appendix, it will be necessary for the construction of the project to be initiated in accordance with the schedule set forth in the Appendix and for the Government of Sweden to execute a contract for that quantity in time to allow for the United States Commission to provide the material for the first fuel loading. It is also understood that if the Government of Sweden desires to contract for less than the entire quantity of enriched uranium allocated for a particular project or terminates the supply contract after execution, the remaining quantity allocated for that project shall cease to be available and the maximum adjusted net quantity of U-235 provided for in Article VIII shall be reduced accordingly, unless otherwise agreed.

I. Within the limitations contained in Article VIII, the quantity of uranium en-

riched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the United States Commission under this Article and in the custody of the Government of Sweden for the fueling of reactors or reactor experiments shall not at any time be in excess of the quantity thereof necessary for the loading of such reactors or reactor experiments, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Parties, is necessary for the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments.

J. It is agreed that when any special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

K. With respect to any special nuclear material not owned by the Government of the United States of America which is produced through the use of special nuclear materials obtained from the United States of America and which is in excess of the need of the Government of Sweden for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or a group of nations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

L. Special nuclear material produced, as a result of irradiation processes, in any part of the fuel leased under this or the superseded Agreement shall be for the account of the Government of Sweden and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph J of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of Sweden, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with a credit to the Government of Sweden based on the prices in the United States of America referred to in paragraph K of this Article, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Sweden for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

M. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Sweden may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this Agreement, or which have been provided to the Government of Sweden under the superseded Agreement, are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Sweden, the Government of Sweden shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may lease pursuant to this Agreement, or may have leased pursuant to the superseded Agreement, to the Government of Sweden or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Sweden shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any

cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Sweden or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

#### ARTICLE VIII

The adjusted net quantity of U-235 in enriched uranium transferred from the United States of America to Sweden under Articles IV, VI, or VII during the period of this Agreement for Cooperation, or under the superseded Agreement, shall not exceed in the aggregate 50,000 kilograms. The following method of computation shall be used in calculating transfers, within the ceiling quantity of kilograms of U-235, made under said Articles or the superseded Agreement:

From:

(1) The quantity of U-235 contained in enriched uranium transferred under said Articles or the superseded Agreement, minus

(2) The quantity of U-235 contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay,

Subtract:

(3) The aggregate of the quantities of U-235 contained in recoverable uranium of United States origin either transferred to the United States of America or to any other nation or group of nations with the approval of the Government of the United States of America pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, minus

(4) The quantity of U-235 contained in an equal quantity of uranium of normal isotopic assay.

#### ARTICLE IX

A. The Government of Sweden guarantees that:

(1) Safeguards provided in Article X shall be maintained.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Sweden or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, and no special nuclear materials produced through the use of such material, equipment and devices will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Sweden or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement, or the superseded Agreement, and no special nuclear material produced through the use of such material, equipment, or devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Sweden, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation or group of nations, and then only if, in the opinion of the United States Commission, the transfer of the material is within the scope of an Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation or group of nations.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that no equipment or devices transferred from the Government of Sweden to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement, no material purchased by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to paragraph K of Article VII of this Agreement, and no material retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to paragraph L of Article VII of this Agreement, or an equivalent amount of material of the same type of such purchased or retained material substituted therefor, will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or



development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

#### ARTICLE X

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Sweden or any person under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement, or the superseded Agreement, shall be used solely for civil purposes.

B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this Agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the Parties as provided in Article XI, by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

(a) reactor, and

(b) other equipment and devices, the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are, or have been, made available to the Government of Sweden or any person under its jurisdiction under this or the superseded Agreement, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission;

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Sweden or any person under its jurisdiction under this or the superseded Agreement, by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment or devices so made available:

(a) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission,

(b) reactors,

(c) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the conditions that the provisions of this subparagraph B (2) will apply,

(1) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and,

(2) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Sweden or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guaranties set forth in Article IX;

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Sweden and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to Article VII of this Agreement, transferred pursuant to Article VII, paragraph K(b), or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Sweden, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Sweden, shall have access in Sweden to all places and data necessary to account for the

source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B(2) of this Article, to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement, and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article or the guaranties set forth in Article IX and the failure of the Government of Sweden to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B(2) of this Article;

(6) To consult with the Government of Sweden in the matter of health and safety.

C. The Government of Sweden undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article.

#### ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden, recognizing the desirability of making use of the facilities and services of the International Atomic Energy Agency, agree that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under this Agreement. It is contemplated that the necessary arrangements will be effected without modification of this Agreement through an agreement to be negotiated between the Parties and the Agency which may include provisions for suspension of the safeguard rights accorded to the United States Commission by Article X of this Agreement, during the time and to the extent that the Agency's safeguards apply to such materials and facilities.

B. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement on the terms of the trilateral arrangement envisaged in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. Before either Party takes steps to terminate this Agreement, the Parties will carefully consider the economic effects of any such termination. Neither Party will invoke its termination rights until the other Party has been given sufficient advance notice to permit arrangements by the Government of Sweden, if it is the other Party, for an alternative source of power and to permit adjustment by the Government of the United States of America, if it is the other Party, of production schedules. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Sweden shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement or the superseded Agreement and still in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Sweden for its interest in such material so returned at the United States Commission's schedule of prices then in effect domestically.

#### ARTICLE XII

The rights and obligations of the Parties provided for under this Agreement shall extend, to the extent applicable, to cooperative activities initiated under the superseded Agreement, including, but not limited to, material, equipment, devices, and information transferred thereunder.

#### ARTICLE XIII

For the purposes of this Agreement:

A. "United States Commission" or "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Parties" means the Government of the United States of America, including the

United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, and the Government of Sweden. "Party" means one of the above "Parties".

C. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

D. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

E. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

F. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency, or government corporation but does not include the Parties to this Agreement.

G. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

H. "Restricted Data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of Restricted Data by the appropriate authority.

I. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the United States Commission or the Government of Sweden to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the United States Commission or the Government of Sweden may determine from time to time.

J. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the United States Commission or the Government of Sweden determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

K. "Superseded Agreement" means the Agreement signed by the Parties on January 18, 1956, as amended by the Agreement signed on August 3, 1956, the Agreement signed on April 25, 1958, and the Agreement signed on July 20, 1962.

L. "Safeguards" means a system of controls designed to assure that any materials, equipment, or devices committed to the peaceful use of atomic energy are not used to further any military purpose.

#### ARTICLE XIV

This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of thirty (30) years.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Washington in duplicate this twenty-eighth day of July, 1966.



For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER J. STOESEL, JR.  
GLENN T. SEABORG.

For the Government of Sweden:

GÖRAN BUNDY.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C. July 5, 1966.

The President,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed Agreement, which was negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would supersede the "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden," signed at Washington on January 18, 1956, as amended. This is a research-type Agreement.

The primary reasons for entering into a power Agreement are (a) to provide the framework for assuring the long-term supply of enriched uranium fuel required for the projected Swedish nuclear power program and (b) to implement provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, which were added by recent amendments, permitting the performance of uranium enrichment services by the Commission and the private ownership of special nuclear material. The proposed Agreement would have a term of thirty years.

Article VI of the new Agreement would reflect recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Sweden to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such transactions were confined to Governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under the proposed Article VI would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Governments of the United States and Sweden.

Article VII of the proposed Agreement would permit the sale of enriched uranium required for the long-term Swedish power reactor program described in the Appendix to the Agreement and would increase the maximum quantity of U-235 that could be transferred to Sweden from the present limit of 400 kilograms to 50,000 kilograms.

Article VII would also permit the Commission to perform uranium enrichment services after December 31, 1968, for the account of the Government of Sweden under conditions which the Commission may establish. In addition, the Commission would be able, at its discretion, to make available to the Government of Sweden uranium enriched to more than twenty percent in the isotope U-235 when there is an economic or technical justification for such a transfer.

In keeping with stated Commission policy, Article VII also includes language which assures the comparability of domestic and foreign prices for enriched uranium and services performed, as well as of the advance notice required for delivery.

Article IX of the proposed Agreement contains guarantees by the Government of

Sweden against atomic weapons or other military use of materials, equipment and devices received from the United States. The proposed Agreement includes new language similar to that contained in the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and Switzerland by which the United States makes similar guarantees. The United States' guarantee would extend to (a) special nuclear material produced through the use of special nuclear materials obtained from the United States which is in excess of Swedish needs and which the United States decides to purchase and (b) special nuclear material produced in United States-leased fuel which the United States elects to retain after it has been reprocessed, or, alternatively, to equivalent amounts of such purchased or retained material.

In keeping with United States' policy to arrive at explicit understandings with countries with which we have cooperative agreements as to the transfer of safeguards to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Article XI of the proposed Agreement provides that the Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for applying safeguards to materials and facilities subject to safeguards under the Agreement.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed Agreement will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Governments of the United States and Sweden. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the proposed Agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Chairman.

#### Sweden's nuclear power program

Reactor	Power megawatts net electrical	Start of construction	Criticality date	Total kilograms U <sup>235</sup> required
A. Marviken nuclear power station	200	1963	1968	2,932
B. Oskarshamn nuclear power station	400	1966	1969	9,386
C. State power board, nuclear station II	500	1970	1974	10,396
D. Atomkraftkonsortiet nuclear station II	500	1971	1975	9,093
E. State power board nuclear station III	500	1972	1976	9,596
F. Atomkraftkonsortiet nuclear station III	500	1973	1977	8,373
Total				49,776

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1966.  
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD.

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter:

a. a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a copy of a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a copy of a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, revises the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Israel which was signed on July 12, 1955, as amended by the agreements signed on August 20, 1959, June 11, 1960, June 22, 1962, August 19, 1964, and April 2, 1965.

Enclosure: Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 12, 1966.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me a proposed superseding "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Sweden" and has recommended that I approve the proposed Agreement, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Approve the proposed Agreement, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) Authorize the execution of the proposed Agreement on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Article I of the proposed amendment would raise from ten to forty kilograms the net quantity of U-235 which may be transferred to Israel for fueling research reactors. Article I would also permit the transfer to Israel of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer.

Article II of the proposed amendment reflects the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Israel to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such arrangements were confined to governments. Arrangement made directly between private parties under Article II would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and Israel. A similar provision has been incorporated in the Agreements with Switzerland, Turkey, the Philippines, and the United Kingdom.

Additionally, there is an editorial revision in Article I which would delete the now-obsolete provision that the Government of Israel retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States may acquire title to such material.

The amendment will enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government



written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements to bring the amendment into force.

Cordially,

JIM RAMEY,  
Acting Chairman.

Enclosures:

1. Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of Israel (3).
2. Letter from the Commission to the President (3).
3. Letter from the President to the Commission (3).

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy signed at Washington on July 12, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), as amended by the Agreements signed at Washington on August 20, 1959, June 11, 1960, June 22, 1962, August 19, 1964, and April 2, 1965,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. Paragraph A of Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended by deleting the number, "ten (10)", which appears before the word, "kilograms", in the proviso to the first sentence thereof, and substituting in lieu thereof the number, "forty (40)".

B. Paragraph C of Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed eight (8) kilograms of the isotope U-235 contained in such uranium."

C. Paragraph D of Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is deleted in its entirety; paragraphs E, F, G, and H of said Article are, respectively, relettered as paragraphs D, E, F, and G.

ARTICLE II

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information referred to in Article I, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of materials, including special nuclear material, and equipment and devices, and for the performance of services. Such arrangements shall be subject to:

- (a) the limitations applicable to transactions between the Parties under Article II,
- (b) Article V, and
- (c) applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the Parties."

ARTICLE III

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1966.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DZ  
DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,  
Director, Office of Atomic Energy Affairs, International Scientific and Technological Affairs, Department of State.

BHT  
BARBARA H. THOMAS,  
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Israel:

JE  
JOSEPH EYAL,  
Attaché, Embassy of Israel.  
AUGUST 12, 1966.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would revise the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Israel which was signed at Washington on July 12, 1955, as amended by the Agreements signed on August 20, 1959, June 11, 1960, June 22, 1962, August 19, 1964, and April 2, 1965.

Article I of the proposed amendment would raise from ten to forty kilograms the net quantity of U-235 which may be transferred to Israel for fueling research reactors. In addition, Article I of the proposed amendment would permit the transfer to Israel of material enriched to more than 20% in the isotope U-235 when there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer. These changes are proposed in order to meet Israel's plans for the future operation of its research reactor.

Article II of the proposed amendment would reflect the recent changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permitting private ownership of special nuclear material by enabling private parties in the United States and Israel to be parties to arrangements for the transfer of special nuclear material. Previously, such arrangements were confined to governments. Arrangements made directly between private parties under proposed Article II would be undertaken pursuant to applicable laws, regulations, policies, and license requirements of the United States and Israel.

Additionally, the amendment would also include in Article I an editorial revision which would delete the now-obsolete provision that the Government of Israel retain title to enriched uranium until private users in the United States may acquire title to such material.

Following your determination, approval, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended,

it will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

Chairman.

Enclosure: Proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel".

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, August 17, 1966.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,  
Atomic Energy Commission,  
Washington.

DEAR MR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me by letter dated August 12, 1966, a proposed Amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) approve the proposed amendment and determine that the performance of the Agreement, as amended, will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America;

(b) authorize the execution of the proposed amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

WEST VIRGINIA PROVIDES SITE, COAL, WATER, AND MANPOWER FOR VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER CO. AWARD-WINNING SYSTEM—GOVERNOR SMITH IS DEDICATION SPEAKER AT MOUNT STORM—TELLS OF SHARED PROGRESS

MR. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a truly significant dedicatory ceremony was held in the highlands of Grant County, W. Va., on August 19, 1966. Virginia Electric & Power Co.—Vepco—dedicated its multimillion-dollar Mount Storm power station there on that date. The event, attended by approximately 4,000 officials and citizens, likewise was in the nature of an appropriate recognition of the fact that the new power station feeds the Nation's first 500,000-volt transmission system, for which Vepco received the electric utility industry's highest honor—the Edison Award.

The Mount Storm station and its related 500,000-volt transmission lines were constructed at a cost of approximately \$182 million. Actually, the station was constructed outside of the Vepco service area in the rugged and picturesque West Virginia mountains, and the reason for the location was the abundance of nearby coal and water, enabling the electricity to be generated and transmitted over a 390-mile, 500-kilovolt transmission system on a favorable cost basis.



The Vepco story of its Mount Storm development begins with a recognition that 95 percent of the electricity produced for its 900,000 customers throughout 32,000 square miles in Virginia, part of West Virginia, and part of North Carolina is generated in coal-fired stream stations. Vepco, like others in the electric utility industry, seeks ways to reduce the cost of generating and distributing power. One of the primary obstacles has been the increasing delivered cost of fuel.

Inasmuch as 45 percent of Vepco's coal cost is for transportation, the company determined that the Mount Storm station would substantially reduce its fuel bill—and this already has proved to be a fact.

So, at Mount Storm, Vepco is operating a mine-mouth generating plant, and this, coupled with extra high voltage transmission, is a prime example of "coal by wire." It is providing an economical and reliable source of electricity.

And, in building the facility, Vepco also created a 4-mile stretch of clear water which offers many recreational opportunities on its 1,200-acre surface. The lake is accessible from West Virginia State Highway 93, recently completed between the town of Davis in Tucker County and the community of Bismarck in Grant County. That roadway crosses the 50-foot-wide Stony River Dam and affords a sweeping view of the scenic lake and the Mount Storm power station.

The dedication program began with a concert by the Petersburg High School Band from Petersburg, W. Va. George F. Duborg, Vepco's vice president for its western division, presided as master of ceremonies. The prayer of dedication was by Dr. Richard E. Shearer, president of Alderson-Broadus College, Philippi, W. Va., and the benediction was by Dr. Gordon E. Hermanson, president of Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va. The Senator now speaking was privileged to deliver the message of welcome to West Virginia, and E. H. Will, chairman of the board of Vepco, gave the speech of welcome to the dedication ceremonies. A. H. McDowell, Jr., president of Vepco, introduced Gov. Hulett C. Smith of West Virginia for the dedication address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the prayers of Drs. Shearer and Hermanson, the welcome messages by this Senator and Mr. Will, the presentation remarks by Mr. McDowell, and the dedicatory address by Governor Smith.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER OF DEDICATION  
(By Richard E. Shearer)

Almighty God, we have come to this mountainous plateau to dedicate an electric power station—object of man's genius, but also object of Thy wondrous blessings.

As we begin this ceremony, O God, make us aware that we are Thy children created in Thy Image with nature placed at our feet. Teach us also that blessings bring responsibilities, and that sonship with Thee has its demands. Remind us that man is great when he lives in partnership with the

Almighty and in harmony with Thy divine laws.

As we stand on this site we sense how great is that partnership in this enterprise.

Thou has created—man discovers—so Edison found the secret of the incandescent bulb.

Thou has stored the coal in the bin of the earth with a special supply in the hills of West Virginia—we mine it and put it to use running gigantic turbine generators. Grant us the conscience and unselfishness to return some of the beauty to the earth when our mining is complete.

While man builds skyward, Thou dost send Thy sun and rain downward to replenish the earth.

We plan bold projects, Thou givest life and time to see them accomplished.

As we dedicate the Mt. Storm Station, we not only salute planners, engineers, workman, corporation leadership, stockholders, and public officials who made it possible—we also recognize and reverence Thee as Lord of Life.

May the years ahead prove the soundness of this venture. May the result be warmth and joy in many homes through the utility derived. And may our nation be a place where light abounds because we live in righteousness and peace.

In His Holy Name, we pray. Amen.

WELCOME TO WEST VIRGINIA

(Message by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH)

It is a genuine West Virginia welcome that we extend to our friends of the Virginia Electric & Power organization who are, in fact, real benefactors in this constructive contribution for progress.

The millions invested in our State are appreciated, as are the many months of employment provided our citizens.

There is a mutuality in these conditions because our State's natural resources and our hardy manpower merit the investments and payrolls being subscribed to this modern and useful facility.

We acknowledge, too, that you and our people have been engaged in very real pioneering in this project, both in the generation and in the transmission of the power developed under ultra-modern technology. I commend these accomplishments and give assurance that they are all the more reasons why we welcome Vepco as a productive addition to the expanding industrial complex of our State.

In this era when the Government is charged with excessive "bigness" and, paradoxically, at a time when there is so much going to Washington to obtain Federal aid, it is appropriate that we express public tribute to this achievement of an investor-owned electric utility.

I have developed a very real appreciation for the network of investor-owned producers and distributors of electric energy.

Twice in the almost 8 years while I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, legislation to legalize additional bonding for the Tennessee Valley Authority has been before us. In both instances, the legislation was used as a vehicle by some persons who advocate expansion of the TVA service area and, who worked diligently for amendments to extend TVA into areas being served by local and grid inter ties of investor-owned utilities.

When a member of the House of Representatives, I voted for the Tennessee Valley Authority as a regional development instrumentality and to provide a so-called "yardstick" for rate evaluations and comparisons.

But, after almost three decades of TVA experience, I have expressed in words and actions my opposition to the "yardstick" becoming a "walking stick."

In 1959 and again a few weeks ago we defeated amendments intended to authorize

TVA to expand into franchise service areas of investor-owned utilities.

I supported the TVA and the Rural Electrification Act, but I oppose the efforts of either or both when those efforts seem to me to be inducing unfair competition into the electric energy systems.

But I definitely oppose substituting public power for existing investor-owned facilities proved to be serving as useful, efficient, and fair public utilities. We have the public service commissions in the states and the Federal Power Commission to see that the investor-owned and other private sector power companies are regulated in the public interest.

Neither do I favor the so-called "all-Federal" or the exclusively Federal reservation of the power features in large water projects authorized and funded under Federal flood control and other related programs. If these facilities—such as the one authorized for the Rowlesburg Reservoir in neighboring Tucker and Preston Counties—have provisions for power, and if they are in the service area of an investor-owned utility, I believe the power should be open to negotiation, with first preference to the service existing in the area.

West Virginians and Virginians join, I believe, in the purposes to be served by this plant. We can, and we will, build better for a future committed to prosperity and progress.

WELCOME MESSAGE

(By E. H. Will, chairman of the board of Vepco)

This is indeed the "happy ending" to another chapter in the history of Vepco. It has been an exciting history because of such projects as this Mt. Storm mine-mouth station. Preparations for this day began some years ago when this plant was just a gleam in the eyes of our engineers at Vepco. Today we see the results of the many, many hours of planning and working toward this goal. It is truly a happy occasion for us—especially this opportunity to welcome you and to hear from your Governor and other distinguished speakers.

We greatly appreciate your acceptance of our invitation to be with us today and we take pleasure in knowing that you wanted to be here for the culmination of a most important undertaking in this area of West Virginia.

This project represents the results of forward planning, engineering and construction achievements, investment by private enterprise and pioneering efforts in the designing of the nation's first 500,000 volt transmission system, for which Vepco received the industry's highest honor—the Edison Award. This award was given "For distinguished contribution to the development of the electric light and power industry for the convenience of the public and the benefit of all." We are quite proud of this achievement and it is with this in mind that the Mt. Storm Power Station will be dedicated "to the service of our present and future customers."

Today I represent our Board of Directors, our 900,000 electric customers, our 5,100 employees and our 43,000 shareholders in welcoming you to this milestone in Vepco's progress.

Many, many thanks.

INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNOR SMITH AND FORMAL DEDICATION OF STATION

(By A. H. McDowell, Jr., president of Vepco)

I have the honor this morning of introducing a man who is providing excellent leadership to the people of West Virginia as the Mountain State's 27th Governor. He brought a wealth of knowledge and experience in business, education, civic and gov-

ernmental affairs to his position which has manifested itself in his vigorous and progressive administration.

He was born into a family tradition of public service which his father, the late Joe L. Smith, had developed with his distinguished record as Mayor of Beckley, State Senator, State Chairman of the Democratic Party, and as a Representative in the United States Congress for eight consecutive terms.

Educated in Beckley public schools, he went on to Beckley College and was graduated with honors from the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce in 1938 at the University of Pennsylvania. He has a considerable background in business.

He has served as one of the organizers and president of the Beckley Area Rural Development Council, West Virginia Historical Drama Association, and the Beckley Business Development Corporation. From 1948 through 1959, he served as chairman or member of the West Virginia State Aeronautics Commission. He served as State Democratic Chairman from 1956 to 1961.

Selected by Governor William Wallace Barron as the first Commissioner of the West Virginia Department of Commerce, he served with distinction in furthering industrial and tourist development in the State. His role as Commerce Commissioner brought him into the public eye as a man definitely concerned with the future of his state.

He resigned in 1963 to enter the gubernatorial race. His election in November of 1964 came after an overwhelming victory in the Democratic Party primary, in which he set a record by winning 53 of West Virginia's 55 counties. His winning majority in November of 1964 of 77,464 votes was the greatest margin in the Governor's race in 16 years.

His administration has been marked by new advances in education, health, housing and conservation and has stimulated the imagination and inspired the enthusiasm and support of all West Virginians who share his desire to develop the State to its full potential. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege and honor to present His Excellency, Hulett Smith, Governor of the great state of West Virginia.

#### DEDICATION ADDRESS

(By Hon. Hulett C. Smith, Governor of West Virginia)

Since becoming Governor of this state 19 months ago, on several occasions I have wondered aloud how the historians of the next generation would record the successes and shortcomings of this generation.

Today, I am wondering what the thoughts would be of those first men who gathered around a table at Menlo Park, New Jersey, in 1879, and saw Thomas Edison's most famous invention—a small incandescent lamp—the first light bulb to be used successfully in America.

I am wondering what their thoughts would be if they were to join us in Mt. Storm, West Virginia today to see this nation's first 500,000-volt transmission system being dedicated.

Of one thing, I am sure. Certainly, they would join us in praise of the officials of Virginia Electric and Power company for their vision . . . for their initiative in bringing this mammoth and monumental project to fruition.

Edison said, "Genius is one per cent inspiration and 99 per cent perspiration."

He would be impressed by the dedicated work that has gone into this project.

He also said, "There is a way to do it better—find it!"

He would be appreciative of the research and the risks that went into this project.

And he once remarked that "Restlessness and discontent are the first necessities of progress."

He would be in agreement with the decision of Vepco officials to settle for nothing short of the best here.

We are seeing at this ceremony today a sign of new things to come in the years ahead of us.

And I know all West Virginians are grateful that our state of growth and grandeur once again finds itself in the position of pioneering.

This dedication is significant for many reasons.

Not the least important is proof of the fact that major electric power plants in rural areas of the country are not out of question.

Vepco proves this today.

And when we realize that the demand for electricity is expected to double by 1975 from what it was at the beginning of this decade, this becomes all the more important.

Water is a major requirement for such power development, and with the building of reservoirs in the so-called "hill country," we can envision greater developments along this line.

Facilities similar to this one would also benefit southern West Virginia.

There, in the heart of the coal fields, a combination of the water of a small stream, with coal from a nearby mine, would make electricity inexpensive.

It also would be a natural attraction for industrial development and recreation in that part of the State.

This is something that must be given serious thought by all of us.

We can no longer think and act according to the old rules.

We need to think big, and be visionary enough to plan for the future in our thinking.

This is exactly what the Virginia Electric and Power Company has done, and we are witnessing the results of valiant Vepco efforts today.

We also see here an important link between our basic natural resource—coal—and the electric industry.

The mine-mouth coal process, an innovation in mining and electrical power, can be an example for the nation to see—right here at Mt. Storm.

We see here new evidence of how West Virginia's coal industry continues to grow and expand to meet new ideas and new opportunities.

I'm told that when both Mt. Storm station boilers are operating at full load in this plant, 400 tons of coal will be burned an hour; 9,600 tons a day—more than 3,000,000 tons a year!

Really, this is a most impressive set of figures, serving to exemplify what we mean when we say all of our industries—the coal industry included—are being diversified and used for new and exciting projects.

And I point out that our West Virginia coal is not only being used at home, it also is being exported to other countries.

Did you know that West Virginia mines originate 85 per cent of this nation's coal exports? Most of it is shipped through Hampton Roads. Here is a case, too, where Senator RANDOLPH and I worked with our sister state of Virginia to deepen the channel so our state can expand its coal exports.

And the recent trade mission which I sent to Europe returned with information that leads me to believe this rate of export will be even greater in the years ahead—because of the aggressive effort West Virginia is making to expand its coal market.

We see here how West Virginia has again joined in an economic bond with the sister state of Virginia. West Virginia is not the only state to benefit from this progress. Governor Godwin and I have decided that for too long we have heard only of the two Carolinas. We are going to tell the world of

the Virginias—as we cooperate to build a better economy.

In fact, we are joining in a system with our sister states of Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina—all rich in resources and energetic people.

And the power that originates at this plant will be used to light homes and industries in a region from Mt. Storm to Alexandria, and Arlington, and Richmond, and the Shenandoah Valley—enough power to supply the needs of 2 million residential customers.

In providing at least 100 new jobs, this facility also brings with it new recreational uses of Stony River—and a four-mile long lake that provides recreational opportunities for families in this area and many visitors.

This entire area is becoming a new center for recreation use.

Mt. Storm and nearby Petersburg are located on the periphery of West Virginia's most unique recreational resource, the Potomac Highlands.

Here, we find a combination of opportunities for hunting, fishing, camping, canoeing, and sightseeing—opportunities that actually are unparalleled in the Eastern United States.

And the increase in out-of-state visitors to the Highlands during the past few years tells us that the people of the eastern seaboard are rapidly discovering this area and spreading the word of its growth and grandeur to their friends.

The development of the Appalachian Highway system will provide an easy access to the Highlands from any point in the Eastern United States.

This easy accessibility will greatly increase the number of tourists coming through Petersburg and Mt. Storm on their way in and out of the highland region.

Both Petersburg and Mt. Storm can become important service centers for these visitors.

Near here also is Gorman, the beginning of the Scenic Highway—a valuable link in our road system—made possible by Senator RANDOLPH's sponsorship of the enabling legislation.

And, this area's recreational potential also will be enhanced by development of a year-around recreational complex in the Canaan Valley.

The potential also exists for development of a winter sports complex, and both will have a tremendous impact on the area's economy.

The White Water Weekend events at Petersburg already are important to that community at an otherwise slack time of year for tourists.

So the recreational potential of Petersburg and Mt. Storm are unlimited, if all of us are willing to adapt to the tourist industry's needs.

We have Blackwater Falls State Park . . . Cathedral State Park . . . Smoke Hole Caverns . . . Weiss Knob Ski Slope . . . and Canaan Valley.

We also have the Alpine Festival . . . White Water Weekend . . . the Historical and Natural Museum at Davis . . . and the Winter Carnival.

This shows that West Virginia is on the move—and the people of this region are leading the way.

We also have seen road improvements in this area—particularly on Route 93—which represents an important part of my administration's road program to open the previously-inaccessible areas of Tucker and Grant Counties.

Nearly 14 miles of West Virginia 93 have been finished, and the paving of an additional mile between West Virginia 42 and Bismark is slated for completion this year.

As a result of this, a practical artery has been built, and an outstanding scenic attraction has been provided motorists.



The new two-lane route, which has a construction cost of nearly \$3 million, not only crosses the dam here to serve Vepco but it also opens the Canaan Valley for further development.

So what we observe here today is the dawn of a new day for the utility, coal and recreation industry in this part of America—and the beginning of greater things for West Virginia, through the diversification of her natural resources.

As we meet here to thank Virginia Electric and Power Company for its confidence in West Virginia, someone else is working on a project to make gasoline from coal.

As we meet here to pledge Virginia Electric and Power Company our support as it continues to grow and prosper in West Virginia, someone else is figuring out how to cut fuel costs by improving the mine-mouth technique of coal mining.

So we are going to see many new innovations come about in the electric utility industry, as well as in the coal industry, and I believe West Virginia will be in the forefront of both pioneering projects.

To the officials of Vepco, I add to Senator RANDOLPH's welcome by assuring that during the past several months it has been my pleasure to receive periodic reports on your progress. I have looked forward with real anticipation to this day.

On behalf of all our people, I wish you to know that we acknowledge how fortunate we are in having you in West Virginia.

And I also want you to know of our continued support for your pioneering efforts—and I do not say this lightly, because ours are a pioneering people.

We stand side-by-side with you as Vepco progresses—and we in West Virginia will be proud to have you as a partner in progress.

Before closing, it is appropriate to point out with gratification the fact that the Edison Award—the highest available to the nation's investor-owned electric utility industry—was awarded recently to Vepco in recognition of this project.

It was a pioneering award to Vepco in appreciation for the outstanding contribution the company has made to the development of the electric light and power industry for the convenience and benefit of all the people it serves.

We are proud to have you in West Virginia—and our congratulations are extended to all of you in Vepco because of your leadership, your vision, your energy, and because of the confidence you have placed in West Virginia by having the nation's first 500,000-volt transmission system originate here in this plant at Mount Storm.

#### RESPONSE AND CLOSING REMARKS

(By President A. H. McDowell, Jr. of Vepco)

Thank you Governor Smith for being with us today. We are delighted that your busy schedule permitted you to attend our dedication.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the shareholders, directors, officers and employees of the Virginia Electric and Power Company, it is my honor and privilege to dedicate this superbly engineered and constructed mine-mouth power station to the service of the progressive peoples of the State of West Virginia and the area we are privileged to serve. May it serve as an instrument which will help us toward the full economic development of this part of our great nation.

#### BENEDICTION

(By Dr. Gordon E. Hermanson)

Thy years, Our God, are throughout all generations. Of old hast Thou laid the foundations of the earth: the Heavens are the work of Thy hands. They shall perish, but

Thou shalt endure: Yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a garment shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end. The Lord bless you and keep you. The Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift up His countenance upon you and give you peace in your going out and your coming in—in your lying down and your rising up—in your labor and your leisure—in your laughter and in your tears—until you stand before Him in that day to which there is no sunset and no dawn.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3052) to provide for a coordinated national highway safety program through financial assistance to the States to accelerate highway traffic safety programs, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3418) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments; on page 1, line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "\$112,150,000" and insert "\$110,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$950,000" and insert "\$500,000"; on page 2, line 11, after "Sec. 2", to insert "(a)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(1)"; after line 20, to insert:

(b) The authority contained in subsection (a) shall extend to counsel fees, costs, and other expenses of the types specified therein that were incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

After line 24, to strike out:

Sec. 3. Section 13(a) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, is

amended by striking out "\$75" and substituting therefor "\$100".

On page 3, line 4, after "Sec.", to strike out "4" and insert "3"; in line 10, after the word "substitute", to strike out "thereof", and insert "thereof"; in line 11 after "Sec.", to strike out "5" and insert "4"; in line 15 after "Sec.", to strike out "6" and insert "5"; in the same line after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the period; on page 4, after line 5, to strike out:

Sec. 7. (a) The Peace Corps Act, as amended, is amended to add immediately after title I thereof a new title as follows:

#### "TITLE II SCHOOL-TO-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS AND EXCHANGE PEACE CORPS

##### "Declaration of purpose

"Sec. 201. The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States and a further purpose of this Act to promote world peace and friendship through school-to-school partnerships under which United States schools and organizations shall help schools and organizations of interested countries and areas to meet their educational and other community needs, and through an Exchange Peace Corps, which shall make available to United States schools and organizations men and women of interested countries and areas, qualified for service in the United States, to help those schools and organizations in meeting their needs for trained manpower, to provide those men and women with experience that on their return will be valuable to their countries or areas, and to help promote a better understanding of their peoples on the part of the American people and a better understanding of the American people on the part of other peoples.

On page 5, after line 2, to strike out:

##### Exchange Peace Corps volunteers

Sec. 202. Such provisions of this or any other Act relating to volunteers, volunteer leaders, or applicants for enrollment as the President determines to be appropriate shall be applicable to Exchange Peace Corps volunteers: *Provided, however*, That as applied to Exchange Peace Corps volunteers the term "abroad" in subsection 5(d)(2) of this Act shall mean outside of their country or area: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of section 42 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 793) Exchange Peace Corps volunteers shall be deemed not to be citizens or residents of the United States, any territory or Canada and injuries to them, wherever occurring, shall be deemed to occur outside the United States in their countries or areas.

(b) (1) Section 9 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to participation of foreign nationals, is amended by striking out "and" immediately after "volunteers" and by inserting "and to carry out the purposes of title II of this Act," immediately after "where appropriate," in the first sentence.

At the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(2)" and insert "Sec. 6."; and, on page 6, after line 3 to strike out:

(3) Section 15(d)(7) of the Peace Corps Act, which relates to the utilization of funds for unforeseen emergencies or contingencies, is amended by striking out "arising in the Peace Corps".

So as to make the bill read:

That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "1966" and "\$115,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "1967" and "\$110,000,000", respectively.

(b) Strike out "of which not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available for carrying out research" and insert in lieu thereof "Provided, however, That not to exceed \$500,000 of funds made available hereunder for fiscal year 1967 shall be obligated under contracts or agreements to carry out research: *Provided further*, That no such contracts or agreements shall be executed unless the research in question relates to the basic responsibilities of the Peace Corps."

(c) Add a second sentence as follows: "Unobligated balances of funds made available hereunder are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated and may at any time be consolidated with appropriations hereunder."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended to add immediately after the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, counsel may be employed and counsel fees, court costs, bail, and other expenses incident to the defense of volunteers may be paid in foreign judicial or administrative proceedings to which volunteers have been made parties.

(b) The authority contained in subsection (a) shall extend to counsel fees, costs, and other expenses of the types specified therein that were incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act

SEC. 3. Section 15 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to utilization of funds, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (c), strike out "7(c) (2)" and substitute therefor "7(a) (2)".

(b) In subsection (d) (4), strike out "7(e)" and substitute therefor "7(c)".

SEC. 4. Section 25(b) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which defines the term "United States" for the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "and territories".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 16 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to appointment of persons serving under prior law, section 20 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to moratorium on student loans, section 21 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which amends the Civil Service Retirement Act, and title II of the Act, which relates to Internal Revenue Code and Social Security Act amendments, are hereby repealed.

(b) Such repeal shall not be deemed to affect amendments contained in such provisions and the application of the amendments contained in the title. All determinations, authorization, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken, or entered into under authority of the provisions of law repealed by subsection (a) shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

SEC. 6. Section 10(a) (3) of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, which relates to the acceptance, employment and transfer of gifts, is amended by inserting "or transfer" immediately after "and employ" and by striking out all that appears between "or otherwise" and "and".

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS—CONSIDERATION OF MINIMUM WAGE ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon final disposition of the pending business, or when reported, H.R. 13712, the Minimum Wage Act, be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] plans to address himself to a subject that is not germane to the pending measure. I wish to ask the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] how much time he will require to make his address.

Mr. GRUENING. Approximately one-half hour.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may proceed on this subject notwithstanding the germaneness rule, for one-half hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately upon the completion of the speech of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OUR OBSOLETE CONCEPTS ABOUT NATO—1949 SOLUTIONS FOR 1966 FACTS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Charles de Gaulle's request to the United States that its NATO-committed troops stationed in France be removed may prove to be a blessing in disguise. It may be just the therapeutic shock the United States has long needed to force it to take a hard look at the concepts underlying the coming into being of NATO in 1949 to see whether those facts fit the realities of 1966.

The world of 1966—for better or worse—is a far different place than the world as it existed on April 4, 1949, when the NATO Treaty was signed.

Let us take a quick, overall look at the state of the world on that day to get some idea of the situations which the NATO Treaty was intended to meet, at least in part.

First. On April 4, 1949, the United Nations was less than 3 years old and whether it would succeed or fail as did its predecessor the League of Nations, was an unanswered and unanswerable question. Already the Soviet Union had cast 28 votes vetoing various questions before the United Nations Security Council.

Second. On April 4, 1949, Soviet Russia's Cominform had already been functioning for 2 years as an agency of international revolutionary communism reviving the theme of the capitalist menace. At the founding of the Cominform in 1947, Communist Party leader Zhdanov had declared a permanent "cold war" against the West saying:

A new alignment of political forces has arisen . . . a division of political forces operating on the international arena into two major camps; the imperialist and anti-democratic camp on one hand; and the anti-imperialist and democratic camp on the other.

Third. On April 4, 1949, the blockade of Berlin and the U.S. airlift were still on and were destined to continue for over 5 months;

Fourth. On April 4, 1949, Communist Parties in France and Italy had already been told to foment strikes—which they did—against the Marshall plan;

Fifth. On April 4, 1949, the Soviet Union had already set up peoples' republics in all East European countries and sought to curb all East European contact with the non-Communist world, even to the extent of excluding United Nations personnel;

Sixth. On April 4, 1949, the deadlock in the United Nations over the control of atomic devices still continued even while Werner Heisenberg, 1932 Nobel Prize winner, was announcing that he was almost certain that the Soviet Union was making atomic bombs at two remote Siberian industrial centers;

Seventh. On April 4, 1949, the attempted coup by the Communists in the Kreuzberg sector of U.S.-occupied Berlin 2 months earlier was still fresh in the minds of the people of the United States;

Eighth. On April 4, 1949, the Communist inspired and aided civil war in Greece was still waging;

Ninth. On April 4, 1949, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, had just been arrested and tried on charges of treason, espionage, and black-market dealings and sentenced to life imprisonment, arousing protests throughout the free world;

Tenth. On April 4, 1949, the Russian-dominated army in Hungary had 5,000 more men than was permitted by the peace treaty.

Eleventh. On April 4, 1949, even though the armistice provided for tripartite control of Bulgaria under an Allied commission, with the Communists in control of the government, the treatment of members of the American legation continued to worsen and was to lead, in the next year, to a break in diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the United States.

Twelfth. On April 4, 1949, Austria, contrary to the provisions of the armistice, was still occupied by the Russians.

Thirteenth. On April 4, 1949, the Nationalists in China had already agreed to turn over Peking to the Communists.

Fourteenth. On April 4, 1949, Nehru in India had told Parliament 2 months before that a Communist plot to seize power had been prevented by the roundup of 3,000 Communists.

Fifteenth. On April 4, 1949, South Korea had reported repeated raids by North Korean forces into South Korean territory.

Sixteenth. On April 4, 1949, it was reported that Communists had actively infiltrated the Indonesian Army.

Seventeenth. On April 4, 1949, two protests had already been sent to the Soviet Union by the United States concerning the continued Soviet occupation of Iran.

This then is a quick, incomplete overview of the state of the world on April 4, 1949, when the NATO Treaty was signed.



It was a world in which international communism was on the march seeking world domination.

To counteract its moves, President Truman during the preceding year had asked Congress for the enactment of the European recovery plan—the Marshall plan—pointing out that it was needed to “forestall Russia’s clear design to swallow up the remaining free nations of Europe,” citing the “tragic death of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, pressure on Finland,” the military attacks on Greece by non-Greek Communists, and the many violations of peace treaties.

It was in the light of these events that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was brought into being a year later under the leadership of the United States, uniting the United States, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom in a pact which declared that an armed attack against one country is to be considered an attack against all.

But the world—especially the European world—is in every way a far different place in 1966 than it was 17 years earlier in 1949. And yet we continue in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization using the same concepts that we did when NATO was first formed.

The time has come—indeed, it has long since passed—for the United States to rethink those concepts in the light of present-day facts.

Canada and our European allies in NATO were never more stable both politically and economically than they are today.

Italy is not today racked by Communist-led strikes—neither is France.

In 1949, the fastest plane available took 22½ hours from New York to Berlin. In 1966, the flight can be made in 10 hours. By 1966, we had proven our ability to airlift an entire armored division of 15,000 fighting men and their equipment from Texas to Europe in 63 hours.

And, still, the United States, acting in 1966 without any apparent consideration of the vastly changed circumstances of our European allies, continues to maintain 1 million fighting men and their dependents in the European theater.

In 1949, U.S. gold reserves were 24.5 billion; on August 12, 1966, U.S. gold reserves had shrunk to 13.3 billion, down 400 million since the first of the year. The unnecessary stationing of a million American troops and their dependents in Europe undoubtedly contributed to this outflow of gold.

I returned recently from a trip to Europe where I visited a number of military facilities and discussed the pending move of our bases out of France. While this trip was concerned primarily with the disposal of surplus property, a matter which is of concern to the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, and which the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, Senator JOHN McCLELLAN asked me to analyze, my meetings with top officials of the Departments of State and Defense provided the opportunity to inquire into the broader aspects of our re-

lationship with the NATO countries and the premises underlying our current military policies in Europe.

This trip left me thoroughly dismayed at the lack of imaginative and creative thinking on the part of the top echelons of U.S. policymakers involved in Europe. It is no secret that the basic premises of NATO which were thoroughly valid at the time NATO came into being, are being increasingly questioned by our NATO allies. The most fallacious reasoning of our State and Defense planners is that Gaullism will disappear with the passing from the political scene of President Charles de Gaulle. If U.S. policy is to be broken out of its mold and freed from its present immobility, it must recognize that the circumstances surrounding the establishment of NATO are no longer a valid justification for the continuation of an outmoded strategy, and that France does not stand alone in questioning the basic premises on which NATO has been operating since its inception.

No evidence was found that any rethinking was in process on the part of U.S. officials. On the contrary, the major efforts of our policymakers appear to be directed toward the preservation of NATO in its present form without France and with developing the justifications for the continuation of its present strategic doctrines.

The men with whom I discussed these matters are dedicated and sincere in seeking what they deem the best course of action for the United States. They are concerned with the possibility that the Soviet Union may again embark on a course of “adventurism” as it did when it precipitated the Cuban missile crisis. These officials, involved as they are with the entire spectrum of the possible threats confronting our country and charged with the responsibility for assuring the security of our country against all possibilities of aggression, are justified in their concern that the withdrawal of France from the NATO organization may be the beginning of the erosion of our military strength in Europe. They are apprehensive that the diminution of our military presence in Europe might well be taken by the Soviets as a signal that the United States would not react to overt aggression and that pressure on Berlin or on West Germany would find a militarily weakened and divided Europe unprepared to meet such action.

There is no pretense on my part to have any special insight into the intentions of the Soviet Union. That country remains as much as ever “the mystery wrapped within an enigma” that Winston Churchill described many years ago. It is apparent to me, however, that many of our top policy officials have spent their formative careers in efforts to bring NATO into being and in unrelenting efforts to establish it as an effective political as well as military force. They now find it difficult to depart from their role as salesmen to take the really hard look at NATO that changing circumstances require. It is, of course, perfectly obvious that the Europe of 1966 is far different from the Europe of 1949. The economic strength of the continent

has grown to proportions scarcely imagined when the Marshall plan was launched and when weak currencies, stagnant industries, and chronic balance-of-payments difficulties seemed to be Western Europe’s inescapable destiny. Concomitant with the economic growth has come an increasing dissatisfaction with unquestioning reliance on the United States to provide leadership for the alliance. President de Gaulle’s insistence that subordination of military forces to a NATO supranational command is inconsistent with the basic requirements that the decisions affecting a country’s national interests, and the means for protecting such interests, must remain the unfettered responsibility of a sovereign country, has met widespread support outside of France.

The simple fact of the matter is that the United States is the only really effective supporter of NATO and that the other NATO countries pay only lip service to the Organization and to its underlying strategic concepts—a truly anomalous situation in light of the fact that the primary purpose of NATO is the defense of Western Europe.

One of the countries in which I was interested during my trip to Europe was Belgium, because of the likelihood that some bases and materiel would be moved there from France. That country is considered as one of the two or three strongest advocates of NATO. Yet data obtained from U.S. officials in that country clearly show that its support is forthcoming only as long as it does not have to put up the resources to make a truly effective contribution to the military effectiveness of NATO.

Belgium has been devoting a decreasing percentage of its resources to its defense budget. In 1953 it allocated 5.3 percent of its gross national product to defense; by 1963 it had gone down to 3.7 percent; and additional declines have occurred since 1963.

The Belgian Air Force is still equipped with obsolete F-84 aircraft which are no match for even the older models of Soviet jet fighters. Funds for procurement of modern fighter aircraft have not been allocated and it is obvious, therefore, that the Belgians do not consider it important to have an up-to-date air force.

Belgian resources devoted to logistics—to the supply and maintenance of its army forces—are considered inadequate and the total number of personnel in the army falls short of the number required to form the divisions originally planned by NATO.

No more illuminating illustration of the Belgian lack of conviction in NATO can be found than in the recent discussions which have taken place as to where SHAPE headquarters are to be located. France’s withdrawal from the NATO organization has been accompanied by the demand that NATO forces and headquarters be removed from French soil. This has necessitated finding a new home for SHAPE headquarters which is now located a short distance outside of Paris.

After considerable discussion the Belgian Government agreed to offer SHAPE



a new home. Top officials with whom I discussed this matter in Europe told me that it was imperative that NATO headquarters be located in a large metropolitan center for reasons of communications and transportation. The Belgians, however, after much internal discussion of the impact on the Belgian economy of the relocation of SHAPE headquarters involving the transfer of several thousand NATO employees to Belgium, agreed finally to offer NATO a site 40 miles southwest of Brussels. The selection of this site was determined by domestic economic considerations rather than by the urgent requirements of NATO that its headquarters be located in a major metropolitan area. The headquarters site selected is in one of the distressed areas in Belgium where unemployment is a problem and where the funds brought in by NATO personnel could be expected to help the local economy. In addition, the site offered by the Belgian Government involved a minimum expenditure of its own funds; the site offered involved land already owned by the Belgian Government which is largely unutilized at present.

Understandably General Lemnitzer has expressed dissatisfaction with the Belgian offer but it appears at the moment that NATO has little choice but to accept since no other country is rushing forward with more satisfactory proposals.

Unfortunately, Belgium is not an isolated case insofar as it involves half-hearted support for NATO in the area where such support counts most—that is, in the amount of resources, of money and men, that a country is ready and willing to devote to NATO.

Canada has reduced its defense budget by more than half since 1953, as measured by defense outlays in relation to gross national product. Greece, still a recipient of substantial military assistance from the United States despite its booming economy, has cut its defense expenditures by one-third in terms of its gross national product. Similarly with Norway and the Netherlands. Great Britain's expenditures as related to gross national product have declined by about 40 percent since 1953; only in the case of West Germany do we find an increase in defense expenditures which exceeds the rate of growth of that country's economy.

With the withdrawal of France from NATO, and the imminent likelihood that Great Britain will find it necessary to withdraw a large number of forces from those committed to NATO and now stationed in West Germany, the Soviet Union would be justified in concluding that the real strength of the alliance which confronts her is to be found not in the NATO organization but in the forces of the United States and Germany which are drawing together ever more closely.

In this connection, I want to call attention to the impending move of the headquarters of the U.S. European Command, or EUCOM as it is called by my military friends. For many years this headquarters, which operates directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff in directing the operations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Europe, has been located

just outside of Paris at Camp des Loges. This location, in close proximity to General Lemnitzer's NATO headquarters at SHAPE, made eminent sense since the Commander in Chief of EUCOM was also Deputy Commander in Chief of SHAPE.

But now it has been announced that EUCOM is to be transferred to Germany, with Stuttgart as the most likely location. How can this be taken other than a downgrading of NATO status and an increase in the cohesion between the United States and Germany? If there is one single specter haunting the dreams of Europeans these days, it is the one of a militarily revitalized Germany bent on exerting its growing strength to satisfy its own nationalistic aspirations as it has done repeatedly in the past and acting in concert with the United States to do so under the guise of an anticommunism stance.

I am fully appreciative of the fact that U.S. policy in the postwar period has been to avoid precisely this development by seeking means of binding Germany more closely into a European community and integrating its military forces into a European command. Nonetheless, the danger has now become apparent that in the disarray that follows on the heels of the French withdrawal from NATO, the U.S. military leaders will seek to maintain a position of strength by alining themselves closely with the military forces of Germany—the only country that has shown itself willing to embark on the expanded military effort considered necessary under prevalent strategic doctrines.

Perhaps this makes sense from strictly the military viewpoint. If we are required to maintain large land armies on the European Continent, which I seriously question, then the United States must look to Germany for its principal support since only that country has shown its willingness to levy the kind of forces required under the outmoded concepts of conventional warfare on which our strategy is predicated. But what of the political consequences of a United States-German alliance? Will not the other European countries view the move to EUCOM to Germany as further evidence that Germany has become the principal ally of the United States?

I believe that it is not too late for the President to reconsider the transfer of EUCOM and earnestly urge that he have our Embassies in Europe canvass popular sentiment on this issue before he makes his decision final in this matter.

Returning to the matter of the effectiveness of NATO, my trip to Europe and the discussions I had with our top military leaders have reaffirmed the doubts I have had in accepting the administration playing down the significance of the French withdrawal from NATO. Contrary to what is being put out by our State Department, the loss of French forces and French soil to NATO is a major emasculation of that organization. Our military leaders in Europe can hardly imagine fighting a conventional war against the Soviet Union under circumstances in which they are deprived

of the logistics base which France has provided in the past.

Let me cite two examples to indicate the seriousness of the French withdrawal from NATO and the consequent necessity for the United States to move its forces out of France by April 1, 1967. Oil and gasoline are the very lifeblood of modern military forces. Unless a steady supply of petroleum is assured, our forces cannot move in the air or on the ground. This vital requirement is now being met by a pipeline running from the French channel ports through France to NATO forces in West Germany. The pipeline also feeds, at a number of points, pipelines which run to the Benelux countries. On April 1, 1967, this pipeline, which was built entirely with U.S. funds, will come under the control of the French.

France, and particularly the Paris area, is the heart of our communications network in Europe and on to the Middle East. The impending loss of the heart of this network to the French threatens our entire command communication system from the United States all the way through to Pakistan. Numerous studies are now underway to find stopgap means of overcoming this loss.

The fact was mentioned earlier that the petroleum pipeline running through France was built entirely with U.S. funds despite the fact that it was designed to support NATO forces, and thus should have been funded jointly by NATO. Here is further evidence of the failure of the NATO countries to support effectively their organization. Data I obtained in Europe showed that the United States has had to spend out of its own pocket hundreds of millions of dollars if it wanted to construct all of the military bases and facilities it considered essential. The European NATO countries limited their contributions mainly to airfields, though in the case of the largest airfield constructed in France, the large complex at Chateauroux, construction costs were borne mainly by the United States.

The reason for the lack of European support for NATO, in terms of the resources the European countries are willing to contribute to that organization, is fairly obvious. As long as the United States is prepared to take on the lion's share of the burden of providing for the defense of Europe, there is little reason for Europe to do more than is absolutely necessary. But the consequences are to vitiate the purposes and objectives of the NATO alliance. With the United States taking on most of the NATO costs, providing most of the manpower and retaining under its control the only really effective deterrent—nuclear capability—there is bound to be a loss of interest on the part of the other members of the alliance.

This loss of interest has manifested itself in two areas which have been considered vital by the United States. American hopes that the NATO military organization, no matter how ineffective from a strictly military point of view, would be an essential instrument for achieving the political unification of Europe, seems as far from realization now



as when the NATO organization first came into being. We have been plugging away at this policy ever since the end of World War II, regardless of what political party has been in control.

Walt Rostow, now on the President's staff, gave clear expression to this policy in 1963 when he said:

The major historic lesson of the Second World War; namely, that in the world of the second half of the 20th century the individual nation-states of Europe could only execute effectively a major role on the world scene if they were to unite. The arena of world affairs had widened out to embrace the whole of the planet; and the technology of effective power had outstripped the scale of the old states of Europe.

But the lack of political cohesion in Europe is greater than ever and it will take more than the pronouncements by our State Department that NATO has now survived its crisis to reestablish a forward movement to European efforts at political unity.

Nor has the United States been any more successful in obtaining NATO interest, to say nothing of participation, in areas of concern to us outside of the European continent. We continue to pursue our policy in southeast Asia without the material assistance of our NATO allies. We continue to feed the hungry nations of the world out of our own agricultural abundance without any commensurate contribution in foodstuff, or in funds to purchase foodstuff, from our NATO allies.

I see little prospect that Europe will proceed at a faster pace toward the goal of political unity or will more fully and effectively participate in shaping the course of events in other areas of the world until such time as it takes on its own shoulders the burden of providing for its own defense.

This has been forcefully expressed by one of the top political leaders in Germany, former Defense Minister Franz-Josef Strauss, who is quoted by C. L. Sulzberger in the New York Times on August 17, 1966, as follows:

There are 300 million Europeans in NATO. Isn't it ridiculous to say we are unable to defend Europe unless 225,000 American soldiers remain here? This can't be a permanent condition. Europe must be able to establish its own defense organization—tied together with a continued American commitment and smaller presence.

This would loosen United States political and military control in Europe, but it would also make the United States more mobile. Look at Vietnam. Supposing there were suddenly some new critical area in South America or in Africa, crying for American help. We Europeans must be able to replace part of your strength here. For now it isn't really an alliance but an American military protectorate surrounded and helped by minor supporters. I only want to normalize relations and create a permanent alliance between our two continents.

The calls for changes in NATO come from many quarters, and most importantly from our NATO allies. Lester Pearson, of Canada, in June 1966, called for a reassessment of NATO and deplored the attitude of the United States in resisting change. He said:

Well—it was done. Gradually, hesitantly, painfully, but steadily, things were done.

An alliance that was designed to be more than military was welded together in peacetime. Its members began to believe in the possibility of a secure peace—of a good life. Indeed as the years went by, many even began to forget or ignore the continuing dangers of a yet more horrible war. So they became impatient with the structures and the processes that had made their own comfortable conclusions possible. They—some people and some governments—began to fall back into those historic nationalist grooves which had been the source of so much of the bloodshed and conflict and chaos they had recently endured. With recovery came also impatience and doubt and some distrust.

We should have seen this happening in the Atlantic Alliance and countered it. In December '64, Canada proposed in NATO a reassessment of the nature of the alliance in the light of these changing conditions. Little was done.

Unhappily, it is man's weakness to cling to the ideas, the institutions and the habits of the past—even the recent past—instead of adapting them to the needs of today and tomorrow.

So it was with NATO. The weight of inertia and a vested interest in a new status quo, felt especially among the most powerful governments of the alliance, made it difficult to find anyone in a responsible position on either side of the Atlantic who was prepared to come forward and specify in detail what should be changed. A lot of people were talking about the need for change but nobody—no government—in a position of power was really doing much about it. Then abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us. Crisis—as always—forced our hands.

The Canadian Prime Minister says of NATO that:

It must also be more than a military alliance. Try as we might, we were never able to make NATO much more than that. An alliance for defense only, however, is an anachronism in the world of 1966, especially when nuclear power is not shared, by possession or by control, among its members. As Professor Hans Morgenthau has put it: "It is no longer possible to rely completely on the promise of a nuclear ally to forfeit its very existence on behalf of another nation." A guarantee of nuclear support against aggression simply does not now have the credibility that would make it a fully effective deterrent and therefore a guarantee of security.

But while our policy planners have recognized the reluctance of our NATO allies to support U.S. concepts which call for the deployment of large numbers of conventional forces in Europe, we have refused to consider alternative policies as Mr. Pearson has indicated.

Thus, Secretary of Defense McNamara testifying on June 21, 1966, before the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations said:

While I believe that some of our European partners could and should spend a greater percentage of their national income for defense than they do, the primary problem in my view is what might be called the management problem of collective defense efforts.

There are substantial imbalances in our respective contributions to defense, in our forces weighed against the threats and plans, and in our defense burden sharing arrangements. In too many instances, the forces of the different countries in the Alliance bear insufficient logical relationship to each other in terms of the men, equipment, supplies and deployment. In too many instances the plans of the military authorities bear insufficient relationship to realistic estimates of

resources that will actually be available to them, and unsatisfactory relationships to the most likely range of contingencies with which they may be confronted.

We continue, therefore, to press our NATO allies to provide greater conventional forces, something they have indicated very clearly that they will not do. We continue to insist on our exclusive control of nuclear weapons which the European countries see as the only really effective deterrent to Soviet ambitions. Their demand for a greater share in the control of nuclear forces is met by such palliatives as study groups and ad hoc committees which do not begin to meet the aspirations of a continent growing rapidly in economic strength, anxious to free itself from American domination and desirous of achieving control over its own destiny.

The central problem has been stated most clearly by Henry A. Kissinger when he said:

When the United States gave economic assistance to Europe after World War II, it tried to induce its European Allies to assume responsibility for developing a joint program and a system for dividing up the total available aid. Though United States representatives played an active and important advisory role, the basic scheme was European. This cooperative effort spawned the Schuman Plan and later the Common Market. It encouraged the emergence of a responsible group of European leaders, dedicated to Atlantic partnership and experienced in working with the United States. The Atlantic Alliance owes a great deal to the habits of cooperation and mutual respect developed during the Marshall Plan.

In the military field, by contrast, the United States never encouraged the emergence of a specifically European point of view. It made no effort to stimulate European institutions comparable to those it fostered in the economic sphere . . . Thus NATO strategy has always been based on more or less unilateral American conceptions. The consultative role of our European Allies has been confined in effect to the technical implementation of American views. No specifically European concept of defense—and no real sense of responsibility—has developed.

France's decision to leave the NATO organization and to order the removal of NATO and U.S. bases from its soil, has seriously weakened the military capability of the alliance, especially as it relates to conventional warfare involving the use of large-scale ground forces. Concomitantly, it is obvious that our European allies do not share our conviction as to the necessity or desirability of large numbers of conventional forces in Europe—or indeed, of the need for NATO as currently conceived by our administration.

The United States should now face up to this fact and utilize the military base withdrawal from France, not as a reason for attacking President de Gaulle's intransigence and seeking to repair the obvious weakening of the NATO concept, but as an opportunity for a reappraisal of strategy and troop deployment.

No greater step can be taken to hasten the political integration of Europe than to relinquish the responsibility we have carried since the end of World War II as the principal protector of the European Continent. The primary defense of



Europe must rest with the European countries. They now have the capability to provide for their own protection and substantial European opinion indicates that they desire to do so.

We cannot continue to insist that the Soviet threat to Europe is greater than is estimated by our European allies. We should take immediate steps to reduce our forces in Europe substantially and abandon the costly efforts to duplicate in the Benelux countries the extensive network of bases and facilities which we have had in France.

While the French action in withdrawing from NATO will require our abandoning facilities in which we have invested hundreds of millions of dollars, the savings we can effect if we realize that NATO is obsolete and act accordingly will save us a fortune in our balance of payments. We should appreciate that Gaullism will not die with President de Gaulle and our firm friendship with France, so clearly demonstrated in the support we received from that country during the Cuban missile crisis and otherwise so often manifest in the past, should not be jeopardized by recriminations.

We must recognize the legitimate fear of the Soviet Union of a remilitarized West Germany and we should therefore insure that our actions do not give reason for believing that we plan on making Germany our principal ally in Europe. A gesture of considerable political importance would be to relocate such headquarters of our European command as may be deemed necessary elsewhere than in Germany.

I make no pretense that the ideas I have enumerated are original. Senator MANSFIELD, our distinguished majority leader, has called for a reduction in our conventional forces in Europe and Senator CHURCH in his brilliant report to the Foreign Relations Committee, entitled "Europe Today," calls for an upgrading of the European role in NATO military planning. The need for a reassessment of NATO concepts has received wide comment particularly by European analysts, and increasingly top political leaders in Europe are questioning the need for a NATO organization as now constituted. The prevalence of such doubts is clearly evident from a recent article in *Life* magazine by the distinguished reporter Charles J. V. Murphy. He writes:

But it is indisputably true, as I learned when traveling about Europe recently, that De Gaulle does not speak for himself alone. West Germany's retired Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, says: "NATO policy, NATO organization and NATO arms are completely obsolete." Britain's Enoch Powell, "shadow" defense minister in the Conservative party's standby cabinet, is more categorical: "Taking into account the Sino-Soviet split, the new leadership in Moscow, we would not have occasion now to form NATO, if NATO did not exist." Charles de Gaulle has forced the U.S. Government to face up to the fact that Europe, by and large, has lost confidence in American leadership. NATO, the magnificent triumphal arch of American diplomacy which was created 17 years ago to shore up the Western world, is in collapse; a famous and fruitful era is coming to a close.

My trip to Europe last month provided merely a means whereby I was enabled to accumulate additional evidence, through discussions with our top political and military leaders, of the validity of the views that Senator MANSFIELD and Senator CHURCH have expressed. In adding my voice to theirs, I am hopeful that the administration can be made to realize that it can no longer "sell" NATO with outworn and outmoded cliches. NATO, as a meaningful instrument of organizing the political and military cohesiveness of Europe, no longer exists. This fact must be recognized, and the sooner, the better chance the United States has of avoiding the tag of the "great defender of the status quo."

I ask unanimous consent for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Lester Pearson's speech of June 11, 1966, the articles by Mr. Sulzberger in the August 17, 1966, *New York Times*, and Mr. Murphy in the July 25, 1966, *Life International* magazine; also Mr. Cowan's article in the August 22 *New York Times* on relocation of NATO Headquarters in Belgium.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ATLANTIC UNION

(An address by the Right Honorable L. B. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, at the Atlantic Union Award Dinner, Springfield, Ill., June 11, 1966)

In conferring on me an Atlantic Union Pioneer award this afternoon, you have done me high honour for which I am very grateful. You have confirmed my admission into ranks of the Atlantic Pioneer Corps, and have chosen for the confirmation this historic setting of New Salem and Springfield, steeped in memories of one of the towering figures of history.

At the same time you have added to my feeling of grateful appreciation by coupling my name with those of Christian Herter and Adlai Stevenson, as recipients of the Atlantic award. I know, as you do, how much we owe to these two men. Not only the United States and Canada, not only the Atlantic community, but the whole world is in their debt.

Mr. Herter is an old and valued friend about whom I will say only that high ideals and constructive achievement have characterized everything he has done, in the service of his country and of free men. I wish he could have been with us this evening.

Adlai Stevenson was also my friend. When he died I tried, as many others did, to pay him tribute. We all tried and I think we all failed, because it is still too soon to take the true measure of this man and his contribution to our times. He wore out more than his shoe leather in the persistent and patient search for peace and better relations between nations. In spite of all the difficulties, sometimes it seemed the impossibilities; in spite even of his own occasional doubts, he served with grace and distinction, with devotion and wisdom, the vision of what the world could be and what it must become. His was a more significant service than anything a man could do for himself or for his own political aspirations. Though he was denied the presidency of his country in favour of others who shared his ideals, he gave an inspiring lead, especially at the United Nations, to his own people and to all people in the search for those ultimate and essential goals which we must reach or perish.

As I look back on the years through which we have passed since the second Great War of this century, I am struck by the fact that our destinies have depended so very much on the vision and leadership of a few men; on their understanding of what, at a particular moment, was the right way out of danger, and the right way to move ahead. These rare individuals had always before them an ideal of human brotherhood; of a world at peace and with freedom. They also had a firm and confident sense of direction in trying to achieve their ideal. Chris Herter and Adlai Stevenson are such men.

Clarence Streit is another who for many long years now has accepted the challenge of a great idea—the idea of a federal union of the peoples lying on both sides of the North Atlantic as a step to an even wider union of all men. That idea has not yet been realized. Indeed in some of the Atlantic countries it seems at the moment to be of little interest. But it is acting upon the societies of our two countries and I believe is doing the same, although perhaps less noticeably, in Europe. It has life and dynamism. Its impact on politics in North America has increased and this is bound to convey a reflection on the other side of the Atlantic.

NATO—the Atlantic alliance—is an encouraging, if imperfect, reflection of this ideal. It has served us well for the past sixteen years. NATO could hardly have achieved its political and its military expression, however, if the yeast of the Atlantic unity idea had not been at work before the Treaty of 1949 was signed.

When Clarence Streit published "Union Now", he was called a visionary, a dreamer. How could governments and peoples, long imbued with their own proud traditions of history, of nationalism, and of sovereignty—how could they give up some of their very substance, of their state freedom, to form a union with other nations; even for those national purposes which, the history of our century has shown, could no longer be achieved except by collective action? But they did.

If the lessons of history are depressing, it is because they seem never to be learned—at least until it is too late. Yet we can also take some comfort from the historical record; when we look at the scene around us and the road ahead.

If we tend to become too depressed over the troubles that face the world today, we should recall how things seemed in the Atlantic world in the late 1940's.

In 1948 it was our hope that Western Europe and North America working through co-operating national governments could provide a nucleus of military strength, economic prosperity and political stability, around which a global balance could be re-established and the extension by force of aggressive communist imperialism be stopped. We did not know at that time whether this would be possible at all. We did not know, whether, if it were possible, it would take five, ten, twenty or fifty years to accomplish. We certainly cannot even say today that it has been accomplished. But we have reached a kind of provisional framework—an equilibrium—in which we can live together, both we and the Communists, with a hope for progress to something better than mere co-existence.

Indeed, some of our troubles today are the results of our successes in these recent years. In 1948 we were anxious and frightened—with cause—at the threatened extension westward of totalitarian communism, into those European countries which, while still free, were badly shaken in their political confidence and almost completely disrupted in their economic life. After the war our problems were of immediate, not ultimate survival. But today we are concerned



with longer range problems of peace, of prosperity, of development. This is a measure of our progress.

Once the course of history has been changed, even a little, we are prone to look back and regard that change as inevitable. But in 1945, as we looked ahead, there seemed nothing inevitable or certain about the reconstruction of a democratic, prosperous, independent western Europe that was to take place. There seemed nothing inevitable about a change in the old American habit of peacetime isolation, which had been dominant for 150 years. It was far from inevitable that countries, who had never in peacetime pooled any part of their sovereignty, would do so now and together organize a collective defense that, in the conditions of the modern world, might prove effective enough to deter another war. We were up against physical destruction, economic stagnation and political defeatism. Vast human and material resources had been blown away and destroyed in war. Out of this waste and weariness could we really construct something new that might help to meet and solve our problems?

Well—it was done. Gradually, hesitantly, painfully, but steadily, things were done. An alliance that was designed to be more than military was welded together in peacetime. Its members began to believe in the possibility of a secure peace—of a good life. Indeed, as the years went by, many even began to forget or ignore the continuing dangers of a yet more horrible war. So they became impatient with the structures and the processes that had made their own comfortable conclusions possible. They—some people and some governments—began to fall back into those historic nationalist grooves which had been the source of so much of the bloodshed and conflict and chaos they had recently endured. With recovery came also impatience and doubt and some distrust.

We should have seen this happening in the Atlantic Alliance and countered it. In December '64, Canada proposed in NATO a re-assessment of the nature of the alliance in the light of these changing conditions. Little was done.

Unhappily, it is man's weakness to cling to the ideas, the institutions and the habits of the past—even the recent past—instead of adapting them to the needs of today and tomorrow. So it was with NATO. The weight of inertia and a vested interest in a new status quo, felt especially among the most powerful governments of the alliance, made it difficult to find anyone in a responsible position on either side of the Atlantic who was prepared to come forward and specify in any detail what should be changed. A lot of people were talking about the need for change but nobody—no government—in a position of power was really doing much about it. Then abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us. Crisis—as always—forced our hands.

We should have acted earlier and not under the compulsion of events. We should have tried to move forward together to a closer international association in order to remove the risk of sliding backwards. In these matters, there is no standing still. Surely the course that should have been taken—should still be taken—is clear.

Today, the facts, the compulsions, and the opportunities lead inexorably toward closer international association and away from the self-sufficient sovereignty of the nation state. The jet planes that fly, the rockets that range in outer space; the universal revolution of rising expectations, combined with the speed of technological change which make their realization possible, all these make it essential that we move ahead in the field of political and social organization in a

way which is at least remotely comparable to our technological and scientific progress.

We can begin with the "like-minded" Atlantic nations, who have already acquired a sense of community and a habit of co-operation, but we must include ultimately all mankind. The world is too small for less, yet we continue to boggle even at the first careful steps.

If there is anything that has been made crystal clear by the grim experience of half a century, it is that neither peace nor security nor prosperity can be achieved or maintained by national action alone—or by national policy alone.

So this is no time to weaken in our support for the NATO alliance, because it is having difficulties. We must solve these difficulties. But we must not stop there. We must move forward with new resolve toward an international community with common political institutions, which covers more than a single continent, and spans the Atlantic.

It must also be more than a military alliance. Try as we might, we were never able to make NATO much more than that. An alliance for defense only, however, is an anachronism in the world of 1966, especially when nuclear power is not shared, by possession or by control, among its members. As Professor Hans Morgenthau has put it: "It is no longer possible to rely completely on the promise of a nuclear ally to forfeit its very existence on behalf of another nation." A guarantee of nuclear support against aggression simply does not now have the credibility that would make it a fully effective deterrent and therefore a guarantee of security.

I repeat, we must develop common, unifying political institutions which would provide for collective foreign and economic policies, as well as genuinely collective defense.

Nothing less will be adequate to meet today's challenge of jets and rockets and hydrogen bombs.

As a leader of a government, I am very conscious that politics is the art of the possible. Anyone with political responsibility must think in terms of what can be done at any given time; of what public opinion will accept. He must not allow the best to become the enemy of the good. Nevertheless, if we don't keep "the best" always before us as an eventual and essential objective, not only will we never reach it; we may even fail to reach the more immediate and good objectives. Nor should we wait for a crisis to force us to act.

In 1940, Great Britain—only a few years before, cool and confident behind its channel—proposed full union with France. It was the moment when continental Europe was about to fall a victim to the Nazi aggressor. The offer was too late. Offers made under the imminence of defeat and collapse, for radical and immediate action to implement ideas which the day before yesterday were considered as visionary and unrealistic, such offers always are too late. Do we have to have panic before we can make progress?

At this moment, moreover, a feeling of discouragement is more likely to work in the wrong way; not in the transformation of NATO into something better, but in its reduction into something less. This is a very real danger. French policy has underlined it.

General de Gaulle has rejected Atlantic defence integration. He has ordered France's withdrawal from the North Atlantic Defence Organization. In doing so, his procedures have been brusque and his ideas disturbing to France's friends and allies.

It would be foolish, however, to push the panic button over this. By doing so, we might merely push France, not only from the NATO military organization, but out of the Atlantic Alliance itself. And France does not want to leave the Alliance.

It would be short-sighted, also, not to realize that the attitude of Western Europe to American commitments in Europe is changing; just as the attitude of Eastern Europe toward Moscow is changing.

We should not try to throw all the blame on France and General de Gaulle for recent NATO developments. Some of General de Gaulle's decisions, I know, have been disconcerting and seem to indicate a return to a kind of nationalism from which France has suffered as much in the last 50 years as any country in the world. Before we condemn, however, we should try to understand what is behind France's recent actions. France is not, has not been, and will not be, satisfied with an Atlantic Organization, or an Atlantic Alliance of independent states, dominated by America. France, and not only France, feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough, (in large part because of the generous assistance of the U.S.A.) to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the Alliance.

While France is not alone in this feeling, only de Gaulle has translated it into policy and action. If he has gone too far in that action, the right course is not to drive him farther in the wrong direction, but to try to bring him back onto the right course by seriously re-examining the purposes and the organization of NATO in the light of 1966—not 1948. As I have said, we should have done it years ago. If the reason for General de Gaulle's action is his belief that we will not change NATO to meet new conditions, let's push ahead with the necessary reforms. Surely it doesn't make sense to take the position any longer that NATO is sacrosanct and mustn't be altered. Our reaction should be just the opposite.

In short, to rail at General de Gaulle, because he is demanding, for France, a position in the Atlantic Alliance equal to that of Great Britain and somewhat closer to that of the U.S.A., is to show a dangerous misunderstanding of the situation.

May I refer on this point to some observations in Max Frankel's penetrating article, "Our Friends, the French," in the April number of "Freedom and Union."

Mr. Frankel is somewhat critical of his own country's share in the responsibility for NATO, as he puts it, "becoming an anachronism whose defensive or military purposes were long ago overtaken by technological change and whose diplomatic purposes we have never managed to define or construct." He believes that not de Gaulle's stubbornness, but a long chain of events and conflicting governmental policies—including those of the United States—have caused the disarray.

I do not see the Atlantic nations going forward together to a secure and hopeful future without France. Therefore, we must find a way out of our present NATO difficulties so that France can fully participate in the march to greater, not less Atlantic unity.

We must not give up the ultimate vision of closer Atlantic unity just because some clouds are obscuring the immediate future of NATO.

Indeed, a new move forward to realize the greater vision may help remove some of the nearer clouds.

We must now look at the picture ahead of us with the courage and imagination we showed 17 years ago when the NATO pact was signed. Taking the same cradle area of the Atlantic nations, we must ask ourselves what sort of Atlantica would we like our children to inherit from us in five years, ten years, twenty years? What sort of vision of the future can we hold up as a rallying point—as an objective of policy; without pretending that it must turn out the way we wish but convinced in our own minds that, given good will, dedicated hard work, and a certain amount of good luck, it could be that way.



This forward march must be Atlantic, and not merely European or North American. But it must provide for more control by Europe of its direction and its character; a Europe, moreover, which would include Great Britain.

I realize that a united Europe, would, in its political, economic and military decisions, be more independent of Washington than is the case now. But what is wrong about this?

There are those who worry about the "separateness" of such a European development and who would therefore prefer to concentrate now on the federal union of all the Atlantic peoples, even at the expenses of earlier European union. If we are realistic, however, we may have to accept at this time the more practical immediate objective of a united Europe; not as an obstacle to, but as a stage on the way to, Atlantic union.

If we cannot at present achieve a pattern of Atlantic federalism, it may be necessary to acknowledge the realities of the situation and, as North Americans, work with Europeans in the hope that, in the longer sweep of history, both Europe and North America will come to realize that their respective affairs can best be harmonized in an Atlantic union. If an intervening European stage is necessary, however, it must be taken not in continental isolation but in close Atlantic co-operation and understanding.

As I try to grope my own way towards a concept that would make sense for North America, and for both western and even eastern Europe, I am sure of nothing except that we cannot insist on retaining NATO in its present form as the only foundation for building an international structure more appropriate for the future. I am equally sure that continentalism either of the European or North American variety will not be adequate.

Finally, I am convinced that only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity. Without her active participation and support, nothing can be done; at least on the broad front which is essential. Without such leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and progress.

So we in other countries should be heartened by the fact that 111 senators and congressmen from thirty-four states, and from both parties, have co-sponsored or supported the Resolution on Atlantic unity; along with ex-Presidents, former Presidential candidates and Governors. The list includes two names that mean much to all free citizens throughout the world, President Truman and President Eisenhower.

With this kind of backing, with this kind of understanding and vision, who dares not take this initiative seriously?

Years ago, before the North Atlantic Treaty or the United Nations Charter, even before the United States or Canada had ever been heard of, when the Sioux and the Blood Indians hunted over the western prairies, their young men on coming of age would retire alone to some hill or mountain. There in solitude, fasting, watching, they would seek before entering on their years of maturity to look at themselves with the best that was in them; to purify their thought and their feeling; and to seek the guideposts they would try to live by as men. This solitary vigil they called "Crying for a Vision". Now, more than ever before, we need as individuals, as nations, to "cry for a vision"; and then, with devotion and persistence, to strive for its realization. It is a tribute to the peoples who live on both sides of the Atlantic that, at critical times in their history, they have always rallied to a great and challenging cause once they were convinced that this was the right and necessary thing to do.

Tonight I pay my humble tribute to those good and brave men—some are present here

tonight—who are working with single-minded dedication to bring about that conviction which will be the foundation of policy and action looking toward a union of peoples in the cause of peace.

What we seek is new, unprecedented. But so is our world. Abraham Lincoln once said: "As our case is new, so we must think and act anew."

Today, we must think anew and act anew.

[From the New York Times, Wednesday, Aug. 17, 1966]

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS: AN IRISH PLAN FOR GERMANY

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

ROME.—One might summarize impressions of a recent trip to Bonn as follows: The Adenauer era is over, with interment of his basic policy that if West Germany only stays strong the East will yield, permitting national reunification.

The Germans have seen their principal allies start to weaken military garrisons there. They have seen the United States increasingly preoccupied with Asia; yet this has not resulted in immediate Soviet pressure. They have seen de Gaulle shed France's former inhibition about better relations with the East and take a dramatic lead in seeking improvement.

#### MANAGERIAL TYPES

They have seen the Berlin Wall brutally help East Germany, whose intelligentsia is now forced to concentrate on improving conditions at home instead of escaping abroad. More West Germans see their East German counterparts as managerial types, not doctrinaire ideologists.

Bonn's own allies have been urging the Germans to take a fresh look at their problems. Foreign Minister Schröder has worked quietly to improve relations with Communist countries, and last year saw a startling increase in trade. A new generation, free of old phobias, is edging toward control.

When the Evangelical Church called for recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier with Poland there were no violent reactions. West German Socialists sought a meeting with their communized Eastern counterparts. Two years ago such developments might have produced a howl. Now people ask: "Why don't they do more?"

Reunification becomes an increasing obsession, but there is decreasing hope that it can soon be achieved. Thus, for example, former Defense Minister Franz-Josef Strauss, Bavarian boss and a contestant for future power, concedes this is a long-term project. He says:

"Soviet policy is this. (1) To consolidate control over East Germany. (2) To isolate the Federal Republic in the permanent role of an internationally accused war criminal. (3) To paralyze Bonn both politically and militarily while fascinating it with the bait of reunification.

"But Moscow won't accept a unified Germany under any terms—not if we offered to quit NATO, demilitarize for a century and invest 100 billion marks in the Russian economy. It wouldn't even accept a unified Germany under a Communist regime for fear this could become a competing center in the disunited Marxist world.

#### CORDON STALINAIRE

"For Moscow, Germany's division is a function of the splitting of Europe. We must therefore envisage a belt from the Baltic to the Adriatic and convert it from a cordon Stalinaire into a cordon sanitaire, neutral and with doors opening to both East and West. We must create a European architectural structure into which Germany can be integrated."

Strauss, often called a German "Gaullist," doesn't want to dissolve NATO but to in-

crease Europe's specific gravity in the alliance. He argues:

"There are 300 million Europeans in NATO. Isn't it ridiculous to say we are unable to defend Europe unless 225,000 American soldiers remain here? This can't be a permanent condition. Europe must be able to establish its own defense organization—tied together with a continued American commitment and smaller presence.

"This would loosen United States political and military control in Europe but it would also make the United States more mobile. Look at Vietnam. Supposing there were suddenly some new critical areas, in South America or in Africa, crying for American help. We Europeans must be able to replace part of your strength here. For now it isn't really an alliance but an American military protectorate surrounded and helped by minor supporters. I only want to normalize relations and create a permanent alliance between our two continents."

#### A NEW FRONTIER

Germans nowadays place more hope in ultimate unity through drawing together Europe itself. They seem to have reached a new frontier. They don't expect Russia to yield East Germany voluntarily for any price and they see dwindling chances of United States strength achieving unification.

Perhaps unconsciously they are assuming a position similar to that of Eire, another partitioned land. Dublin's perspicacious Government hopes some day to link up in a larger community with Northern Ireland when both, with Britain, are admitted to the Common Market and some kind of eventually federated Western "Europe." Many Germans have started to think an even greater "Europe" may be their own only road to unity.

[From Life International magazine, July 25, 1966]

#### DE GAULLE'S BOLD POWER PLAY

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Once again, only three months after he had decreed that all NATO forces must leave French soil, Charles de Gaulle was engaged in another bold power play. This time, in pursuit of his apostolic vision of Europe as "a fertile whole," he spent 12 days touring the country of that onetime arch-enemy of NATO, the Soviet Union. To De Gaulle Russia is simply another nation-state, to be feared or respected as other powerful states are respected. "De Gaulle," says a highly civilized European diplomat, "looks at the world through a deadly prism—the Roman view of politics as power." It may be true, as a former British ambassador to the U.S. David Ormsby-Gore, now Lord Harlech, believes, that De Gaulle is not nearly so sophisticated about the world as his manner suggests ("When he calls America an Anglo-Saxon country, that proves he has not looked at your population makeup lately"). But it is indisputably true, as I learned when traveling about Europe recently, that De Gaulle does not speak for himself alone. West Germany's retired Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, says: "NATO policy, NATO organization and NATO arms are completely obsolete." Britain's Enoch Powell, "shadow" defense minister in the Conservative party's standby cabinet, is more categorical: "Taking into account the Sino-Soviet split, the new leadership in Moscow, we would not have occasion now to form NATO, if NATO did not exist."

Charles de Gaulle has forced the U.S. government to face up to the fact that Europe, by and large, has lost confidence in American leadership, NATO, the magnificent triumphal arch of American diplomacy which was created 17 years ago to shore up the Western world, is in collapse; a famous and fruitful era is coming to a close.



In what remains of the Western Alliance, European power is polarized in the figure and personality of De Gaulle. This 75-year-old warrior-statesman, so serene in considered action, so graceful in his command of 19th Century prose, so intellectually and physically fearless, is now the personal force to be reckoned with in Europe. In fact, Europe has seen nothing to equal him as a statesman-philosopher since Bismarck. "Resist him," warns a NATO diplomat who did resist him, "and he will hate you. Obey him, and he will scorn you. But if you don't stand up to him, he will ignore you, and that's the end of you."

In London, Paris and Bonn, I was fascinated by the wide divergencies in judgments about De Gaulle's philosophy and intentions which are held by the clever and practiced diplomats, soldiers and politicians who have sat down with him. It struck me forcefully that many men who admired De Gaulle—for rescuing the French body politic from the paralysis of petty factionalism and for bringing on France's brilliant economic recovery—have now become apprehensive about him. As Dean Acheson told a Senate subcommittee, "It is impossible to change his mind in any way except by presenting him with facts which he has to meet."

The problem has been to marshal the facts in time to confront De Gaulle before he confronted the world with another fait accompli. During the eight years he has been in power, it has become commonplace to say that De Gaulle is driven by a desire to re-establish the primacy and the grandeur of France; that he is determined to make France absolutely independent, most particularly of her friends; and that he is maneuvering to break the influence of the "Anglo-Saxons" on the Continent. If this were really all there ever was in his mind, we could have put him down long ago as the last (and most brilliant, to be sure) of the archetypal French nationalists and then counted on the wear and tear of domestic politics to do him in. But it hasn't worked out that way.

Instead of eroding away, De Gaulle has steadily gathered influence and purpose in the heart of Europe though the dimensions of his power base have actually shrunk. The settlement of the Algerian civil war freed his hands. By the end of 1961 he had "taken out" the Algerian *Front de Libération Nationale* and dissident elements in his own army and could concentrate on Europe while the U.S. has grown increasingly preoccupied with Asia. Recently Maurice Couve de Murville, France's brilliant foreign minister, said he considered the Algerian peace had wrapped up the last of France's great problems: "[France] has no ambitions outside, unless to participate in the construction of a real Europe, to work everywhere for equilibrium and peace."

"Equilibrium" is part of De Gaulle's belief in "a natural order of things," including nations. But he has his own view of what equilibrium is—or ought to be. Three years ago, by throwing Britain off the stoop of the Common Market, he demolished President Kennedy's so-called Grand Design for Atlantic partnership, which envisioned a United States of Europe that De Gaulle suspected (for excellent reasons) would actually be run from Washington and London. Now De Gaulle has not only ended the 15-year sway of American strategic doctrine in the defense of Europe but has recaptured for himself freedom of maneuver in foreign policy.

Since De Gaulle is a master of speaking his mind on any given situation just as much as he wishes—but not a bit more—these views, expressed in conversation recently with a distinguished American visitor, may be accepted as the most nearly current answer going to the perpetual question of what De Gaulle is "up to." He said:

The Russians experimented with imperialism; it failed them.

Mutual appreciation of the consequences makes nuclear war in Europe, except through ghastly accident, unthinkable, to both sides.

Since the NATO command structure has outlived its usefulness, the indefinite presence of foreign troops on French soil, under foreign command, is not only unnecessary but denigrating.

The problem of a divided Germany is central to Europe's peace. Until we can see more clearly a solution which will leave both the U.S. and the Soviet Union easy in mind, French, British and U.S. troops should stay in Germany.

It is conceivable, although not probable, that Russian leadership could revert to the bad old days—there just could be another Stalin. Because of that possibility, a Western Alliance—but without U.S.-dominated command trappings—must be kept in existence.

It has been said of De Gaulle, as of an early American politician, that he moves upon his tactical objectives with muffled oars. But a European diplomat who has been watching him over a quarter of a century marks De Gaulle rather as a professional gunfighter in a Hollywood western—"the tall, silent man stalking his prey, hands hovering over his pistols, lips pursed, eyes narrowed, seeking complete surprise."

De Gaulle did achieve a stunning surprise in his attack on NATO. True, he had been saying all along that he was dissatisfied. But he gave the impression that he was in no hurry. Even after he disclosed in February that France would, in 1969, alter its military relationship within the alliance (an option the 20-year clause in the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 does in fact provide), De Gaulle and several of his most senior officials took pains in private to assure the principal NATO partners that the issue would not be pressed home, so long as the U.S. was in difficulty in Vietnam.

Then, in March, De Gaulle's thunderbolt was hurled from the Elysée Palace in the form of handwritten notes to NATO chiefs of state: France would withdraw its forces from NATO commands and NATO itself would have to quit French territory. The manner of the doing was so un-French in its brusqueness that the surmise has taken root in NATO chancelleries that, possibly early in March, something made De Gaulle speed up his timetable. But what? No one is sure. "All that is certain," says an American who is in the eye of the hurricane, "is that for the first time De Gaulle is acting like an old man in a hurry."

Any European settlement must begin and end with the German question. But whereas De Gaulle and most French are convinced that the two parts of Germany must sooner or later come together, Soviet policy has focused on keeping Germany divided (pp. 13, 14). In Moscow, De Gaulle suggested that France and the Soviet Union could prepare ground for "the settlement that will one day have to determine the destiny of all Germany. . . ." But he also warned his hosts not to get bright ideas by disregarding "the essential role that the United States has to play in the pacification and transformation of the world."

Despite this significant caveat, there is a feeling in Bonn, London, Paris and Washington that De Gaulle is considering, in a speculative way, not one but several schemes for resolving the German question. There are a number of knowledgeable people who would not be surprised, should Moscow prove responsive, to see De Gaulle attempt to revive the pre-World War I Triple Entente of France, Britain and Czarist Russia that leagued against the rising aggressor—the Kaiser's Germany.

In view of Britain's "special relationship" with the U.S., that has a hollow sound. But there are others who suspect that De Gaulle is secretly advancing a more sinister proj-

ect: to freeze Britain out of any settlement while aligning France with the Soviet Union as a nuclear partner in a deal that would permit the eventual reunification of Germany—but only as a denuclearized and neutralized nation. This would, of course, entail the withdrawal of the U.S. from Germany and the way would be cleared for the reorganization of Europe under a Franco-Soviet guarantee.

All this would be a switch—but not much of a switch—on "demilitarization" or "pull-back" suggestions advanced at various times in the 1950s by Britain's Anthony Eden, Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki of Poland and the American professor-diplomat George Kennan. The mere idea gives the German government the shivers. A high-ranking German defense official says, "Europe would become a sandwich, with the Russians and the French constituting the bread, we Germans the ham, and we would be waiting to see who bites first." And former Defense Minister Franz Josef Strauss warns, "There could be no greater triumph for the Soviets than for the French to leave Germany."

It must be said that French policy has never suggested German reunification in precisely these terms, although De Gaulle has made it clear that he thinks the Germans must take the pledge of nuclear abstinence in our time. The extreme view that De Gaulle is up to a satanic sellout is rebutted to some extent by his public admonition to the Soviets that the U.S. is still in the game and must share in any German settlement.

But another complicating factor is the current sickness of the 1963 Franco-German treaty of friendship which De Gaulle signed with Konrad Adenauer in the same month he told the British Common Market leaders to get lost. In private De Gaulle now speaks of Adenauer's successor, Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, and his foreign minister, Gerhard Schröder, as "American lackeys." His low opinion of Erhard is shared by Franz Josef Strauss, the unruly leader of the Bavarian wing of Erhard's own party, who has been warning the Americans for years that they must not force Germany to choose between American and French leadership. Strauss seems to have made his choice: "I am for French leadership on the Continent, even if the leadership speaks with an anti-American accent."

Some deformation of the German nation as it has existed since 1871 would appear to be an inescapable condition in De Gaulle's "Atlantic-to-the-Urals" concept of Europe. One of its weaknesses may well be, as Lord Hailech points out, that a great deal of what De Gaulle calls "Russia" has moved east of the Urals. But De Gaulle has maintained, through the years, a sharper curiosity about Soviet politics than any other Western head of state.

He grasped, more quickly than most others, the magnitude and meaning of the Sino-Soviet split. He concluded that it was concerned less with doctrine than with issues of geography and power which in his youth went by the name of *Realpolitik*. And, probably more than any other event, it impelled him on his present course. Frenchmen who have heard him discourse on the subject have detected echoes of the old direful theory of the Yellow Peril. The idea is by no means a formal item of policy, and France has chosen a middle posture on Asia. Prime Minister Georges Pompidou holds that Asia has replaced Europe "as a closed arena in which the mighty confront each other." In a conversation a few weeks ago in Paris, Pompidou acknowledged that Soviet Russia's sharpened sense of vulnerability in Asia was one—but only one—of a number of new circumstances which persuaded De Gaulle that rapprochement with Russia is possible. "For that matter," Pompidou went on, "Asia is the first area in the world where the Americans



and the Russians share the same strategic interests."

A great many Europeans, in and out of government, definitely accept the Gaullist proposition that the fate of Europe must be settled by Europeans. The British disarmament negotiator, Lord Chalfont, has spoken of De Gaulle's aims (but not his tactics) as "altogether admirable," and in France, François Mitterrand, De Gaulle's last opponent for the presidency and a spokesman for the non-Communist left, exclaims that NATO is dead.

While Belgium's Paul-Henri Spaak, a former NATO secretary-general, was complaining that De Gaulle "destroys without preparing anything to replace the former order," there was strong Belgian opposition to letting the NATO establishment resettle in Brussels. A leader of the Socialist opposition cried out in Belgium's parliament that the U.S.-directed NATO strategy "is a source of danger." Even Anthony Eden, now Lord Avon, speaks of a "modernized" NATO, and Lord Harlech speculates that the real problem is how to turn NATO from a primarily military instrument into a diplomatic tool.

Foreign Minister Couve de Murville insists that there is no mystery about French policy. "The 'mystery,'" Couve observes in his dry way, "is that people don't believe what we are saying and doing, and think we mean something else. Is it so strange, so unusual, to have a policy that it cannot be accepted?"

As for "peace" or "equilibrium" in Europe, one NATO diplomat said, "God knows, it's what the rest of us want, too, along with an end to the Cold War." But De Gaulle is unique among Western statesmen in that he turned up in Moscow, as *The Economist* pointed out, in the role of "the rebel."

He is the man who stopped the Alliance dead in its tracks. This is something the Russians were unable to bring off on their own. Yet it can hardly be a secret to Moscow that De Gaulle is playing for high stakes with little in his purse. For the Russians, Germany is the door between them and Europe, and East Germany is the bolt on the door. If they should ever decide to allow the Germans to come together, logic suggests that it would be on their own terms.

Meantime, it suits Soviet aims that De Gaulle should make Germany a disputatious subject within the Western Alliance, and that the Germans themselves should lose faith in the willingness of the West to stand up for them. If the younger generation of Germans should decide that the eastern horizon is brighter, the way into Europe, for Russia, would be open through subversion.

This is the danger in De Gaulle's game. It worries even his admirer, Konrad Adenauer. Not long ago, in response to a question about whether he thought the Soviet Union still is a threat to Europe, Adenauer answered, "Of course, that's the one point on which I disagree with De Gaulle."

The brutal fact is that De Gaulle does possess one immensely valuable counter—the geography of France. Without the great space of France—the ports, the roads, the depots, the pipelines—a rational defense of Germany is impossible, except by resort to nuclear weapons from the outset. This heretofore unthinkable fact has made France's neighbors and allies reluctant to accept as complete or permanent the breach that De Gaulle has opened up.

Gaullism is very likely to survive its creator; few heads of state in modern times have reinforced themselves with such a talented collection of lieutenants as De Gaulle has. Meanwhile, in the melancholy words of one of the most influential ambassadors to NATO, "We have no choice but to dance the ballet with him."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 22, 1966]

#### LEMNITZER TO RULE SOON ON DISPUTED BELGIAN SITE FOR NATO HEADQUARTERS (By Edward Cowan)

BRUSSELS, August 21.—Belgian officials expect that within a week or so Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer will decide whether to accept the Belgian town of Casteau as the new site for military headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

General Lemnitzer, Supreme Commander, Europe, has voiced objections to Casteau. If he persists, the issue will fall into the lap of the North Atlantic Council, the alliance's administrative body.

So far, Washington, according to all accounts, has kept out of the dispute.

Friendly diplomats here believe it would be a grave error for Washington to press Belgium for another site. Such pressure would disturb small members of the 15-nation alliance, it is said, and would appear to confirm President de Gaulle's accusations that NATO integration is really subordination to the United States.

#### SITE NEAR BRUSSELS PREFERRED

The problem arises because President de Gaulle has told the alliance that its military headquarters must leave France by April 1, 1967. French units and military personnel have been withdrawn from the alliance's command system and from installations such as Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers, Europe, which is now at Rocquencourt, near Paris.

General Lemnitzer wanted to relocate the headquarters at Everé, a military airfield 3 miles northeast of Brussels and only a few minutes by car from Brussels International Airport.

The Belgian Government has ruled out having the headquarters close to Brussels lest pacifist sentiment be aroused.

Few Belgians have shown enthusiasm for having the headquarters in their country, although many, like their Government, are willing to accept it as a duty.

#### DISTANCE IS A FACTOR

One of General Lemnitzer's principal objections to Casteau is said to be its distance from Brussels—more than an hour by car. The road is smooth and wide in some places, but patched and pitted in others. It is a major truck route and it passes through many towns.

A superhighway is scheduled to be begun in 1967 and finished by 1970 and the Belgian Government says work could be accelerated.

Belgium has also offered a site near Chièvres, a few miles from Casteau. It is no longer in the running. Belgian officials report that General Lemnitzer has said that Casteau is preferable because it is on the main road to Brussels.

Observers believe that another element in passing over Chièvres may have been a protest by farmers who pay low rent for the Government-owned land that would go to the headquarters.

Belgian officials say they have substantially met General Lemnitzer's principal objections to Casteau. While they carefully refuse to preclude the offer of another site, they emphasize that they are offering Casteau.

Allied diplomats add that Belgium has offered to provide the interim financing for construction of military buildings, housing, schools, a hotel and recreation facilities without a prior understanding on the ultimate cost-sharing.

#### PEOPLE ARE APPREHENSIVE

Casteau is a community stretching half a mile along either side of the Mons-Brussels highways. It has 1,800 inhabitants.

They profess to be indifferent but seem to be fearful of the headquarters.

"Suppose I have a man working here," a proprietor said, "and I pay him 50 francs (\$1) an hour. SHAPE offers him a hundred francs an hour and he goes there."

Others made similar observations about domestic servants, whom they foresaw flocking to work for "the rich Americans." Many Belgians automatically speak of Americans when asked about the allied headquarters, unaware or forgetful of the other nationals who also staff it.

The Mons Aeroclub, which occupies a wooden hangar and a two-story clubhouse at the end of a grassy runway, lies a mile south of Casteau on the edge of the 500 acres of Government-owned land offered for the headquarters.

#### PHYSICIAN IS CRITICAL

Dr. Jean Hubert, a Mons physician and president of the club, expressed fear that the tiny flying field would have to be closed. As for SHAPE's helping the economy, Dr. Hubert doubted it, saying "The Americans bring everything they need with them except the prostitutes, and those they take with them when they leave."

But a Mons merchant, Charles M. Moldaver, said, "If SHAPE is here, the town will be booming."

An aerial inspection showed that the 500 set aside for the headquarters are partly wooded and set in the midst of a region of small farms and factories. Canals are being widened to improve freight transportation to the sea. A few miles to the east are piles of the soft coal that Belgium cannot sell because coal from the United States is cheaper.

The Mayor of Casteau, Dr. Fernand Leborgne, said: "The town sees SHAPE with neither a bad eye nor a good eye. We have no extremists here."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not in the Chamber to hear all the speech of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. However, I have read as much of the speech as I could.

I compliment the Senator for what he has had to say relative to De Gaulle's move to change the climate in Europe, and the need for a reassessment of the policy there.

As the Senator so well pointed out, the conditions have changed since 1949 when NATO was first created. Conditions have changed for every nation except the United States. We are still operating on the old theory which was valid at that time, but which certainly holds no water in 1966.

What I mean, in effect, is that we have met our full commitments and more, whereas every other European country in the NATO alliance has failed to meet its full commitments. As a matter of fact, practically all of them have reduced the time served under their conscription systems. Some have done away with conscription entirely. They tell us that the danger from the east and the Soviet Union has decreased. However, as soon as we talk about withdrawing some of our troops, that danger seems suddenly to reappear.

I do not think it is seemly to make a yo-yo out of the United States in this fashion, insofar as the stationing of American troops there is concerned.



I point out also that most of the 30,000 troops in France are not being brought back to this country, but are being shipped to other European areas at the request of their commanders and with the full approval of the Department of Defense.

I see no reason why these troops and their dependents, who number 70,000 or 80,000 in France, could not be drawn back to this country.

I see no reason why, as I have stated before, at least a 10-percent reduction in our troops in Germany and in Western Europe generally should not take place.

I see no reason why, as the Senator has so ably pointed out, the areas of primary responsibilities, and the countries in that area themselves, should not undertake to shoulder a greater responsibility.

I commend the Senator for once again calling the attention of the Senate and of the administration to the situation in Europe. Certainly, in our view of our needs elsewhere and in view of the dollar outflow and in view of the fact that the Europeans are now capable of taking care of their primary responsibilities, I think his statement is worthwhile.

The Senator has made a real contribution.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank our majority leader. A large part of the inspiration for looking into this matter came from his long leadership.

It was pointed out in the past that we could review this situation, that we should reappraise it, and that we should think seriously of reducing our forces. I think that not only would that be useful for the strengthening of the European community, but it also would have a very important bearing on our balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. He is most kind.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], despite the rule of germaneness, may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes, and then, at the conclusion of that time, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who will manage the pending legislation, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### U.S. APPROACH TO CHINA POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I, too, commend my learned colleague, the Senator from Alaska, for his thoughtful speech. As he directed our attention toward the NATO alliance and our problems in Europe, I should like to address myself at this time to our policy toward Red China.

For a number of years, discussion of our policy toward China, the largest nation the world, has been almost taboo. But this year has been one of increasing interest and concern about China. This

has been due in large part to the Vietnamese war and the searching hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I think it is not only healthy but essential that we reexamine and justify any policy. Therefore, I feel that a contribution to the dialog that has begun on China will help to focus attention on the merits of our present policy.

Recently, President Johnson stated that a misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation. The President recognized that lasting peace in Asia depends on ending the isolation of 700 million of its inhabitants. The first step toward this goal was taken by the President when he authorized more liberal regulations to allow American newsmen, medical experts, and other specialists to travel to China. This was a wise and hopeful step.

I think we must now examine whether it is fruitful to pursue a more realistic course toward communication with China at the same time that we continue to oppose its admission to the United Nations. The United Nations could be the best forum for exposing the Chinese to the moderating winds of public opinion. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] recently proposed that we adopt a two-China policy, favoring the admission of Communist China without the expulsion of the Nationalist Government. This policy has been recommended before, but I think it merits fresh examination.

Our opposition to the admission of mainland China, which depends upon a steadily dwindling support from the rest of the world, begins to look more obstructionistic and less realistic as time goes on. It is now becoming clear that the greatest threats to peace will come from the underdeveloped parts of the world. The ability of the United Nations to maintain peace will obviously be limited so long as the largest underdeveloped nation is treated as an outcast.

The rationale for excluding China made some sense when the regime was new, unstable, and of uncertain tenure. But even then we seriously considered recognizing the regime ourselves, certainly a more significant step than one of merely not opposing its admission to the U.N. Today it is clear that, for better or worse, the Communists are effectively governing mainland China. Perhaps it is time to see if our present policy of opposition is in the best interest of Nationalist China as well as ourselves.

The Nationalist Government, while achieving a remarkably fast-growing economy on Taiwan, is, realistically, only the Government of Taiwan. Both mainland and Formosan Chinese Governments feel that Taiwan should be an integral part of a united China. But it is not so now, and it will not be so in the foreseeable future. If someday the two are reunited, then we should recognize that reality, just as we should recognize their separateness today.

The issue of China will soon be before the U.N. again. This issue, returning inevitably each year, will require the use of

our best diplomatic wiles to cajole and persuade other nations to accept the status quo of Nationalist Chinese representation. I think it is time that we asked ourselves if it is worth the effort. Is this an issue on which we wish to commit our diplomatic prestige and flex our national power? I think we should consider other policies that might better meet our objectives rather than this tired old policy of sterile opposition.

The urgency of beginning to think anew about this problem is suggested by the fact that our support on this issue has been so eroded that our position may be defeated in the General Assembly this year. We must consider what this could mean. It could mean that Nationalist China would no longer be a member of the United Nations, and that Communist China would become a member of the Security Council with the veto on readmission of Nationalist China as a new member. It could mean a diplomatic defeat for us and a Red Chinese victory just when Red China's diplomacy is suffering sharp reverses.

It is at this juncture that we should consider formulating a new policy and a new strategy on this issue. A two-China policy is not a new proposal, but it should be seriously considered again by the administration. The main concern expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]—and I share this concern—is that the rights of the Nationalists on Taiwan be preserved. Certainly the majority of the proposals which call for the expulsion of Nationalist China are no more realistic than is our present policy. They ignore the fact that Taiwan, whether an integral part of China or not, is functioning and is governed as an independent country. And it is a country that is larger than two-thirds of the nations that are already members of the U.N. To admit Red China and to oppose a two-China policy would require the members of the U.N. to refuse to recognize a country which is now, in effect, a sovereign nation. This would place them in an untenable position akin to the position which we now espouse, to wit: refusal to admit the de facto status of the present government of China.

A majority of nations would like to see both Taiwan and China members of the United Nations. The only real support for our present policy, ironically, is from the two Chinese governments themselves. Our opposition has been based on the view that the United Nations is a select group of peace-loving nations who have agreed to abide by the charter. This bears little relevance to reality. The Charter of the United Nations has probably been violated by the Soviet Union, by the United Kingdom, by France, by India, and, in the view of much of the world, by the United States. The list of smaller nations committing acts of aggression is too long to mention here. There has been no move to exclude these nations from the U.N. for aggression or resorting to violence.

It should be sufficient to note that it has been proposed, and supposed, from the beginning that the U.N. should be a universal organization which would exist



to provide a forum for peace. It was not, and should not, be an exclusive body. It should be open to all nations willing to give allegiance to the charter so that no threat to peace will be outside its jurisdiction. There are those who say that this will only give the Chinese a chance to disrupt the U.N. But the opportunity for them to work mischief within the body, where they are under the constant scrutiny of all other nations, is probably overrated. The ability of other nations to bring pressure on a China within the U.N. to prevent outbreaks of war is considerably increased. If we endorse the U.N. as the greatest hope for peace in the world, why should we limit its abilities in the area of the greatest threat of war? The problems of Asia in the last score of years have all involved China, yet we have been unable to involve the U.N. in any peaceful solution largely because of China's absence from that body.

The Chinese undoubtedly initially will reject any part of a two-China role. But there is currently an upheaval going on in Chinese government, and there will be further upheavals in the future. We should leave the door open for some more tractable government in the future to accept such a seat. Only a few in this country now think that we made a mistake in recognizing the U.S.S.R. in 1933. The Government of the U.S.S.R. at that time was equally secretive, mysterious, and belligerent. But the channels of communication between the United States and Russia that existed during the Berlin blockade and the Cuban crisis may have prevented a world war. It is certainly a much lesser step to end our opposition to a country's admission to an international body than to extend diplomatic recognition.

The most difficult question is that of which China should hold the seat on the Security Council. There is no easy answer or any sure solution to this problem. But we can begin to weigh alternatives while we still have time to formulate an approach. The size of the Security Council could be expanded or contracted. The Communist Chinese could be given the Security Council seat and the Nationalist Chinese could represent Taiwan in the General Assembly. A change in the veto could be contemplated. It is enough that we begin to consider the conditions that will be faced. If Red China agreed to abide by the charter should the Nationalists then be ejected? I would not think so, but that might follow from our present policy.

It is very important that we do not give the impression that a change of policy is a Communist victory. But, in the face of recent diplomatic defeats by the Chinese, it is much less likely to be interpreted as such today. Any change must be one of not just ending our opposition, but of proposing a new policy, of taking a new position. We must at the same time reaffirm our determination to stand by our allies who feel threatened by aggression in Asia. Then a new policy can in no way be interpreted as a retreat.

I have long hoped that the U.N. could play a greater role in bringing about a

peaceful solution to the Vietnamese war. One underlying problem is that the belligerents are not all members of the U.N. It is extremely difficult for the United Nations to serve a peacemaking function when only part of the nations involved are members of the U.N.

I do not think that any policy initiatives on our part necessarily are foredoomed to failure. While both Chinas consider Taiwan a part of China, the native Taiwanese might be given a chance to vote on separate representation. They compose about five-sixths of the present population of the island and might accept separate representation. The Chinese might seem less recalcitrant once they are given a chance to enter the U.N. I do not think that we can accurately predict what they will do. The press in China takes favorable notice of the dwindling number of nations opposing their admission and also alludes to China's legitimate seat in the U.N. So once offered a seat, after a period of time, China might accept it.

It has been unpopular in this country to advocate any change in our China policy. But we must recognize that congressional as well as Presidential leadership has tremendous influence on public opinion, especially in the area of foreign affairs. If we fail to discuss new ideas, if we fail to call for reexamination of stagnant policies, then we are guilty of blind maintenance of existing policies. I think that we must free ourselves from past assumptions and past prejudices and look at this problem in a fresh light.

If we are to have a new policy in Asia, then let it be a realistic policy which will minimize the chances for a widening war in an area where too many Americans lie dead already. Often our policies outlive the ideologies which created them. Perhaps this has happened to our China policy. Let us not be afraid to change.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Utah for his comments about our China policy. I certainly am in accord with his sentiments.

It has been too long since anyone has really brought our attention back to the United Nations and urged us to give attention to it. I think that it is a sadly neglected institution. It can still remain an important institution. What we do with respect to China may have much to do with the success of that institution.

I join the Senator in his statements, and I congratulate him for bringing this matter to our attention and the attention of the country.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator for his comments. From the position which he occupies, and the great leadership which he has exhibited in foreign affairs, I am highly complimented.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes for morning hour business?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

#### EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION—THE NEXT STEP FORWARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this has been a year of major renewed attention to one of the Nation's great, but still underdeveloped, national resources: educational television. Early this month, on August 1, the Ford Foundation unveiled its proposal to make communication satellites and new much-needed dollars available for educational TV. And before the year is finished, the much-awaited Carnegie Commission report on educational television will be available, months before its originally anticipated release date.

These events have particular significance at this time because the legislation which made educational TV's growth possible—the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962—expires at the end of the current fiscal year. The distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee and the act's author, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, has already indicated that he intends to undertake a major inquiry on the extension and revision of the present law.

All this is of special importance to New York, a State which has had an outstanding history in utilizing TV as an instrument for education. Five educational TV stations are presently operating in Albany-Schenectady, Buffalo, Syracuse, and two in New York City. Two more are expected this year, one in Rochester and the other in New York City. And both the State University of New York and the New York State Department of Education are giving serious thought to the establishment of a State educational TV network.

But, further progress will be frustrated unless the Educational Television Facilities Act is significantly amended. The present law restricts the Federal funds available to each State to \$1 million. The allocation for New York State was used up this spring and additional Federal moneys will be unavailable until the act is amended. Since the law expires on June 30, 1967, there seems no likelihood that any changes might be made before that time. Before these funds will be available, we must look, therefore, to the new legislation which will follow after the recommendations of the Carnegie commission and the Commerce Committee study.

Binghamton, Hempstead and Watertown in New York State, will not be able to fulfill their plans for educational TV until the law is amended. Similarly, elsewhere throughout the Nation, other communities also are awaiting additional funds.

Educational television has brought many outstanding cultural and public affairs programs as well as vital services to our communities and to our schools and colleges, including such recent innovations as assisting preschool education, helping nursing education, training dropouts, retraining older workers and encouraging citizen participation in government.



A major responsibility which the Congress and the Nation must face next year—and an opportunity, too—is extension of the Educational Television Facilities Act. The Carnegie commission and the Commerce Committee studies should furnish excellent guideposts for this advance and in meeting the needs of the Nation.

I rise today to urge the amendment of the Educational Television Facilities Act, because today the Federal funds restricted to each State are \$1 million. For example, in my State any progress has been aborted by this limitation. Therefore, I hope very much that we will enable the States to go forward in accordance with their ability and willingness to go forward, rather than hampering and aborting them with this narrow limitation in the basic act.

#### THE INTERRACIAL COUNCIL FOR BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a valuable private effort to encourage development of Negro owned and operated businesses throughout the country has, since 1963 been made by an organization of volunteer business executives and technicians called the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity.

The son of the Governor of my State, Rodman Rockefeller, is actively engaged in this field.

For the information of Senators I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the council's annual report recently published for the year 1965, as well as a New York Times article discussing the report.

There being no objection, the report and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INTERRACIAL COUNCIL FOR BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY,

*New York, N.Y., August 8, 1966.*

DEAR MR. JAVITS: Enclosed is a copy of our recently printed Annual Report. The attached reprint of a New York Times article about our 1965 Report and the efforts of ICBO further indicates the community interest in our program.

We hope that the report describes fully the work that we are doing to help strengthen the economic sector of the minority community. The case histories beginning on page 20 may be of special interest to you in this regard.

Your interest in ICBO in the past has been helpful and encouraging. We welcome your continued participation and support as we multiply our efforts and service in the future.

Sincerely,

RODMAN C. ROCKEFELLER,  
HARVEY C. RUSSELL,

*Cochairmen.*

#### INTERRACIAL COUNCIL FOR BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY ANNUAL REPORT 1965

##### ABOUT ICBO

On October 30, 1963, the Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress and the Urban League of Greater New York announced the formation of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity. The Council's main purpose—to strengthen and encourage a sense of independence and strength in the Negro communities by the development of Negro-owned and operated business enterprises throughout the country.

In New York and other major American cities, only a small percentage of businesses are Negro-owned. The absence of an entrepreneurial leadership and the predominance of white-owned businesses reduces the mobility of the Negro and inhibits his ascension, except as an employee. This confinement within a stagnating one-class social group creates severe resentments and frustrations, destroying natural motivation and initiative.

The Interracial Council was formed as an effort by private businessmen—both white and Negro—to cope with this critical problem. It aspires to bring together the needs of the Negro business client with the interest and ability of the voluntary business consultant. Its chief contribution has been to help clients start businesses, or to put their existing enterprises in good working order.

The Negro small businessman has all the problems of small business in general, and many more. He rarely has training in business management, or sufficient business background from which to draw. Few Negro young people are inspired to pursue business as a career, or have the opportunity to be exposed to the inner workings of business. Fewer still take management courses, or receive practical training in preparation for a business career.

The Interracial Council furnishes to Negro-entrepreneurs the kind of practical assistance and free business counsel needed to correct this situation.

##### YEAR 1965 HIGHLIGHTS

1. Received Ford Foundation grant of \$300,000; obtained additional financial support during the year from other foundations and corporations including the New York Amsterdam News Welfare Fund, New York Foundation, Henry Nias Foundation, Pepsi-Cola Company, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Dorothy H. and Lewis Rosenstiel Foundation and Schenley Industries, Inc.

2. Expanded services to Newark, New Jersey.

3. Expanded services to Los Angeles, California; subsequently established an Emergency Business Assistance Center in the Watts area of the city immediately following the riots.

4. Presented 1965 Business Achievement Award to Mr. Henry G. Parks, Jr., President, H. G. Parks, Inc. The Council's 1964 Award went to Mr. Asa Spaulding, President of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company.

5. Created and staffed a national office to coordinate and expand the ICBO program.

6. Aided some 470 Negro businessmen nationwide.

7. Helped to initiate over 25 new Negro-owned businesses.

8. Cooperated with Federal and State agencies similarly interested in promoting the economic well-being of the small businessmen.

9. Effected cooperating relationships with the American Bankers Association, Anti-Defamation League, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, National Association of Manufacturers, Economic Development Council of New York, local Chambers of Commerce, and others.

10. Established working relationships with educational institutions such as Columbia University, New York University and the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration of The City College of New York.

##### To the Members:

At the end of its second full year of operation, the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity can report substantial gains in what is becoming a nationwide drive to foster the development of Negro-owned business enterprise. At the beginning of

1965, the ICBO was operating only in New York City. Today, teams of white and Negro businessmen, working together as volunteers under the Interracial Council banner, are advising and assisting clients also in Newark, Los Angeles and as of February 1, 1966, in Washington, D.C.

At the opening of the Washington, D.C. local Council, Vice President HUMPHREY, in a congratulatory message, said: "It is especially important that we develop these opportunities for Negro small businessmen. Their chance to become vital, participating members of our economic system surely provides one important answer to the continuing racial crisis which confronts us in America."

In the near future, it is anticipated that ICBO councils will be formed in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Atlanta and Boston. The accelerated expansion of our program will have been made possible largely by growing financial support from foundations, government, private sources and corporations. By far the largest contribution to date, a three-year grant of \$300,000 from the Ford Foundation, has enabled us to strengthen and enlarge our services, and extend them across the country. Additional support has come from the New York City Anti-Poverty Operations Board and more than a dozen other sources.

Some 470 Negro businessmen received business counsel at ICBO offices last year from 270 consultants. A sign of the future: one of New York's first successful ICBO clients has now himself become a volunteer consultant.

ICBO educational services also were markedly increased in 1965. Of special note are the 12-hour seminar programs begun in New York covering specific business functions such as accounting and merchandising.

Another noteworthy educational program is the Council's Business-in-Action Club for high school students that consists of lectures about business, tours of companies both large and small, and learning to solve real and simulated business problems. In 1966 this program will be extended to schools in ICBO locations outside of New York.

In 1965 and in fact, throughout our short history, the ICBO has faced severe tests. Events did not wait for us. Members will be proud to read in this report of the vigorous and effective crash program of business assistance and rehabilitation undertaken by the ICBO in Los Angeles following the Watts disturbances. The New York Interracial Council was the first private agency active in coming to the aid of small businessmen who faced economic emergencies during the New York City transit strike early in January 1966.

We have been gratified by the number of business and professional people who have volunteered their services as ICBO consultants. Yet we remain short of consultants. In part, the problem is built into the counseling process. Discovering and defining a client's needs often required not merely a single counselor but a panel of consultants which must deal with each case individually.

The ICBO is taking steps to build up strong public relations in the coming year. We will stress that the Interracial Council is not a "civil rights" organization in the usual sense of that term. We are, of course, concerned with human rights, but the Council believes that there is too often a wide open gap between legal rights and genuine economic opportunity. Our mission is to make those rights mean something in practical, economic terms.

During 1965 it became evident that most of our clients lacked the business background necessary to obtain small loans from conventional credit sources. This barrier to Negro enterprise has been encountered again and again. In an attempt to surmount it, the Interracial Council's Board of Directors has



been holding discussions with a number of banks and other financial institutions for the purpose of exploring the feasibility of creating a special loan fund. This new credit instrument would suit our clients' special needs and would not be subject to standardized lending practices.

As a single city organization, the Interracial Council was incorporated April 1, 1965, in the State of New York. At the Board of Directors meeting of January 29, 1966, the ICBO took a long step toward unifying its operations across the country. The Board, in consultation with co-chairmen of each of the local councils, voted to make the ICBO one uniform national non-profit corporation, with all local councils to be independently run as unincorporated units of the national organization. On March 7th, the Interracial Council's national headquarters moved to 110 East 23rd Street, New York City, from its previous offices which had been originally donated by the American Jewish Congress.

Our total anticipated budget for 1966 is \$310,000, based on operations in four cities, and \$410,000 should operations be extended to three additional cities.

We wish to congratulate our clients who have made a start in new business ventures, and those who have improved their earnings from enterprises already in being. Our gratitude goes to ICBO volunteers at each local council, and to those individuals and institutions who made financial contributions to our efforts. We invite all who read this report to help us sustain the momentum in the years ahead.

JOHN T. PATTERSON,  
National Director.

RODMAN C. ROCKEFELLER,  
Co-Chairman.

HARVEY C. RUSSELL,  
Co-Chairman.

June 7, 1966, by order of the National Board of Directors.

#### REPORT ON OPERATIONS

Two dramatic events dominated the ICBO's year of expansion. The first of these was financial. Early in April came the announcement that the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity had received a \$300,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. The grant would have an immediate as well as far-ranging effect on the Council's work. With the help of funds to be made available over the next three years, an estimated 3,400 Negro entrepreneurs would be counseled either in starting or expanding their businesses.

The Ford grant also opened the way for the ICBO to become a national organization, and led directly to the second "break-through" of the year. This was our ability to move quickly following the August riots in the Watts district of Los Angeles. As the *Wall Street Journal* summarized it: "Under a crash program, the ICBO opened a 'business assistance center' in Watts a week after the riots to provide counsel and locate sources of financing for businessmen there."

The Council's activities at the beginning of its second full year were still confined to the Greater New York City area. A vigorous fund-raising drive had started to produce results. Several of the country's great corporations joined with government and foundation sources in contributing financial support. A \$25,000 grant was to be forthcoming from the New York City Anti-Poverty Operations Board.

Near the end of January, Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration (SBA) in Washington, D.C., now Assistant Secretary of Commerce, told an ICBO dinner meeting: "(We) are both committed to the task of helping to build a strong Negro business community. By helping to do this we are strengthening the basic pattern and the balance system that makes our democratic society work. . . .

*And that is why our programs for Negro businessmen are so important. That is why your effort has such great potential."*

By this time progress was being achieved along a number of lines. In April, when the Ford Grant was announced, the ICBO reported having served more than 250 clients. Its volunteer consultants had helped launch a number of small businesses including a supermarket, restaurant, fashion shop, fuel distributor, export office, laundromat and personnel agency, and had analyzed the current operations of many more. This free service costs the ICBO about \$80 per client, not counting the time of ICBO volunteers. It is probably the lowest-cost business counseling service in the United States.

Special efforts were being made to enlist the interest and involvement of Negro youth in the possibilities of eventually owning and managing business enterprises. The Council's first step in that direction was the Business-in-Action Club for high school students which was started at Benjamin Franklin High School in New York. It has enjoyed a strong response.

#### THE PROGRAM EXPANDS

In the early summer of 1965, the ICBO was expanded into a national organization, establishing local councils in Los Angeles on June 10 and in Newark on June 23. On August 2, John T. Patterson, one of the original organizers of the ICBO, was named the Council's first National Director. Since the original Board of Directors at this point, in effect, constituted the Board of the National Interracial Council, the New York City operation was converted into an independent local council on September 15. Three weeks later, on October 7, Aubrey H. Edwards, Assistant Director, was appointed Executive Director of the new unit.

The New York ICBO instituted a series of six-week General Business Seminars for clients. The first covered principles of general business management. The purpose of the seminar program is two-fold. It gives prospective entrepreneurs the chance to discuss business fields before entering them, and enables those already in business to discuss common problems and have their own operations analyzed. Fifty-four graduate students at the Columbia University Business School created a subcommittee to work with the New York ICBO's Committee of Consultants to Small Business.

ICBO consultants and clients have appeared on New York Radio Station WNYC's "Community Action" Program, Station WLIB's "At Home" show, and also on Channel 31 TV. As part of a program on "Small Business in the United States," a United States Information Agency (USIA) unit brought cameras into the Interracial Council's headquarters and made a 4½-minute film of the ICBO at work for distribution in Asia, Africa and South America.

In the year ended December 31, 1965, the New York office processed 199 clients, almost half of whom sought to start new enterprises. At year's end 250 businessmen and women were serving as ICBO volunteer counselors in the New York area.

As 1966 began, the Interracial Council played a significant role in efforts to help small businessmen adversely affected by the 12-day New York City transit strike. In temporary offices, working with Federal, state and city government officials, ICBO volunteers assisted these businessmen in several ways including the preparation of applications for emergency funds from the Small Business Administration to cover losses incurred during the strike.

#### OPERATIONS BEGIN IN LOS ANGELES

A major step in ICBO's national expansion program was taken on June 10, 1965, with the opening of the Los Angeles Council. National Co-Chairman Rodman C. Rockefeller

and Harvey C. Russell plus Charles T. Williams, a member of the Executive Committee of the National ICBO, met with local staff directors of the Los Angeles Urban League and the American Jewish Congress, and with representatives of the Los Angeles business community who would participate in the Interracial Council's work. Victor M. Carter, President of Republic Corporation, and Norman O. Houston, President of the Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Company, were named co-chairmen of the Los Angeles ICBO.

Two months later the new local Council and the national ICBO in New York were combining forces to alleviate the disastrous effects of the Watts riots. The Watts disturbances began August 11 and continued through the 15th.

On August 17, the Executive Committee outlined a program providing for an ICBO Emergency Business Assistance Center in Watts to be "immediately set up and staffed by both paid and volunteer help." The plan suggested: "Supplying its services to business people—both Negro and white—in that area affected by the calamity." Before the day was over, the Los Angeles ICBO was already in action, led by Mr. Carter, Mr. Houston and Acting Coordinator Haskel L. Lazere, Western Regional Director of the American Jewish Congress. The Council arranged for the organization and staffing of the emergency business center in Watts. On the 18th, a \$1,000 grant from the National ICBO got the center started. By the 20th the emergency office had furnishings and telephone service. With the help of a luncheon at the Los Angeles Press Club, enthusiastic editorial support from all news media, growing contributions and pledges of support from state and county agencies, the ICBO was able to open its Emergency Business Assistance Center in Watts less than ten days after the riots began.

Spurred by the Council's successful emergency action in Watts, the Los Angeles ICBO has blocked out an ambitious program for 1966. The Los Angeles Council reported that, as of the end of last year, it had 84 cases assigned to 69 consultants, excluding the numerous cases resulting from the riots in Watts.

#### THE COUNCIL OPENS IN NEWARK

On June 23 the ICBO of Greater Newark began its activities at a luncheon in the Prudential Plaza Building. Dr. Clifford C. Davis, Chairman of the Board of Riverton Laboratories, Inc., and former Governor Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey accepted co-chairmanship of the Newark Council.

From June through December the Greater Newark ICBO interviewed 79 clients involved in a wide range of enterprises. Consultants studied plans for buying a bakery, expansion of a catering business, starting a trucking operation, improving a dress shop and opening a men's store.

The Newark organization at year end had 30 active members on its Board of Directors. More than 50 volunteer counselors serve on the Committee of Consultants to Small Business, 15 serve on the Banking and Credit Committee, and 30 on the Committee for Educational Counseling and Employment.

#### CONSULTANTS TO SMALL BUSINESS

For consultants in Los Angeles, Newark and New York, 1965 was a year of accomplishment and also of experimentation. At each local Council a number of lessons were learned; old consulting methods were discarded or refined, and quite a few new techniques were adopted.

In New York it has become apparent that in some cases team-counseling of clients can be more effective than the "one-to-one" method. Newark agreed that "consultants in related fields must confer with each other . . . to further counsel a client." New York



tried at first to process clients' problems through small consulting groups, but at the end of the year the more difficult cases were being considered in detail by 10-member panels (made up of accountants, lawyers, general businessmen and insurance specialists). This method of processing also enabled the ICBO to review the effectiveness of consulting procedures.

All three local Councils experienced a shortage of consultants in one area of business or another. In particular, accounting services were in demand.

From time to time consultants found it necessary to advise clients against going into business for themselves. When unrealistic and unworkable proposals were submitted for review, it was the ICBO's responsibility to discourage such ventures or to suggest solid ways of modifying them to improve their chances of success.

The need for regular progress reports on clients was stressed by Los Angeles: "Unless consistent reports are made at least every thirty days the work of the ICBO is seriously hampered."

#### BANKING AND CREDIT

All ICBO local Councils offer financial counseling and credit guidance to Negro businessmen. The Interracial Council's directors believe the availability of small loans to be vital to the Negro businessman's full growth, economic future and contribution to the community. If the solution to a client's problem calls for investment capital or loan funds, a credit specialist analyzes his cash requirements, determines the best source of funds available to him and refers him to that source.

In most cases, the best source is a commercial bank. At this point, a hitch all too frequently occurs. The ICBO client in most instances cannot present a background of experience or a performance record that would meet a bank's requirements.

Standardized loan criteria applied, as one committee member has said, "... to people who have been continually under the economic gun," give the Negro businessman little encouragement. It is not the ICBO's intention to criticize conventional banking and credit regulations as such. The belief is rather that an unfavorable credit situation now exists for Negroes and that something must be done to correct it.

In spite of this major obstacle, the Interracial Council was able to help a number of clients arrange loans during the past year. But progress in this area continues to be slow. All local councils are exploring means to increase the availability of business loans to ICBO clients in the months to come. In discussions with banks and government officials, a number of alternatives have been considered. Commercial banks, for example, might be able to establish jointly lendable funds that would not be subject to standard credit restrictions. (This would be comparable to the international funds that provide "soft" loans for projects in the world's underdeveloped areas.)

#### EDUCATIONAL COUNSELING AND EMPLOYMENT

While many governmental and private agencies currently are counseling Negro students, their chief purpose has been to aid school dropouts or potential dropouts. The Committees of Educational Counseling and Employment of local Councils have been concerned with the task of encouraging promising Negro students to acquire training for careers in business. Since their formation two years ago, ICBO Committees on Educational Counseling and Employment have worked with high school personnel, community groups, businessmen and graduate schools of business to meet that objective.

During 1965, the educational counseling committees developed and put into practice several new programs. Early in the year the

Committees developed the concept of Business-In-Action Clubs whereby student groups, under the guidance of the ICBO staff and Educational Counseling Committee volunteers organized themselves into simulated companies. The students are given the opportunity to play the role of managers in solving realistic business problems. Each student "executive" visits his counterpart in a local business concern. The businessman follows up with a visit to the club, where he participates with the students in discussing business problems.

The first club was organized at Benjamin Franklin High School in Harlem. The student response was most favorable. A new club has been organized for the fall term and the number of students responding has doubled from 25 to 50 this year.

The education committees are also concerned with the training needs of our consultants' clients. Recognizing that the small businessman often needs training in basic skills required to operate a going concern, the New York committee initiated the first of a series of General Business Seminars in October. For six two-hour sessions a group of businessmen actively participated in a discussion of what you have to know to start and operate a small business. Actual budgets and financial plans, for example, were brought in and criticized both by students and instructors. The initial response has been favorable, and plans for improvement and expansion of the program are under study.

In addition to the above major programs, the committees are currently engaged in:

Setting up a speaker's bureau, consisting of successful Negro and white businessmen, to talk in schools, churches and clubs on business opportunities for Negroes.

Working with guidance and placement services in high schools and colleges, urging them to encourage Negroes to seek business careers.

Planning a program to interest college upperclassmen in attending graduate schools of business.

Developing a summer program to provide job opportunities in industry for students who had shown an interest in pursuing business careers.

Continuing study and evaluation of new projects and techniques, to successfully achieve the objectives set forth by the Council.

#### CASE HISTORIES

##### *Dressmaking*

Miss Shirley Jordan came to the Interracial Council in January 1965 and asked for assistance in expending her retail-wholesale dress business. Miss Jordan had been in business for 18 months. She is a designer and had been designing and manufacturing dresses which she then sold in her shop. Miss Jordan wanted to expand her retail business and move to a better location.

Benjamin Frank, President of Corduroy Corner, a retail women's fashions establishment, agreed to consult with Miss Jordan. After several meetings, Mr. Frank suggested that she abandon her retail business and concentrate on manufacturing her own designs for wholesale distribution only. He felt that she was a very talented designer and there was a market for her styles. Mr. Frank then helped Miss Jordan set up a small manufacturing operation in her store. He also helped her outline pricing policies and introduced her to several dress shop owners who ordered her clothes. In addition, he himself purchased a number of Miss Jordan's dresses for his store.

Mr. Frank was instrumental in interesting *Women's Wear Daily* in publishing an article on Miss Jordan which resulted in her opening 20 new accounts, including Henri Bendel, one of the nation's most prominent high fashion retailers. As reported in the article,

Miss Jordan said she probably would not be in business today had it not been for "the help, guidance, encouragement and advice obtained from the Interracial Council." Miss Jordan plans to expand her business, and Mr. Frank is continuing to work closely with her as an ICBO consultant.

##### *Carry-out food service*

In August 1965, Preston Lambert approached the Interracial Council for assistance.

He owned an ice cream parlor in Brooklyn which he had been forced to close because of a shortage of working capital. He was trying to rebuild his business.

George King, an officer of Restaurant Associates, Inc., which operates such well known New York restaurants as the Four Seasons and Mama Leone's, met with Mr. Lambert and determined that it was economically unfeasible to reopen the ice cream parlor. A carryout food service franchise seemed to offer better opportunities. Mr. King believed that Mr. Lambert had the experience and ability to operate a successful franchised operation and together they began looking into various possibilities.

Mr. Lambert investigated the Chicken Delight franchise, and was convinced that it would be a profitable one for him. However, not only did Mr. Lambert still lack working capital, but he was also in debt from his last business venture.

The Federal Anti-Poverty program came into the picture as a possible source of funds. With the assistance of ICBO consultant, Gregory Moses, C.P.A., two other members of his team of ICBO consultants and Herbert Lifschitz, an attorney, Mr. Lambert applied for a Federal loan from the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Lambert took a full-time job to save money while he waited for action on his loan application. During this period, he worked out the details of acquiring and operating the Chicken Delight franchise with Mr. King and the ICBO staff.

A problem arose obtaining a waiver of Chicken Delight's requirement of a large deposit to hold a franchise open. Mr. Lambert did not have the necessary funds, and the SBA would not grant the loan until a franchise had been secured. The ICBO, however, was able to arrange for the franchise and loan to be granted simultaneously. His consultants continued working with Mr. Lambert and assisted in the incorporation and other legal matters relating to his prior business.

The loan, for \$18,500, was finally granted. Mr. Lambert and his ICBO consulting team negotiated schedules of payments to creditors of his previous business and opened the new business with the money provided by the SBA. On December 31, 1965, Preston Lambert was finally able to open his Chicken Delight store, at 196 Union Avenue in Brooklyn.

##### *Nursery school*

The case of Mrs. Future Henry of Los Angeles illustrates the ICBO philosophy of helping others not only to help themselves, but to help others at the same time.

Mrs. Henry, who was referred to ICBO by William Bailey of the Los Angeles Board of Education, taught pre-school and kindergarten in that city's school system for six years.

In 1962, Mrs. Henry, the mother of four children, was seriously injured in an automobile accident. During her period of convalescence, personal debts piled up. She was re-employed by the Los Angeles School System in September 1964 but subsequently learned that by reason of a technicality stemming from her financial difficulties, she could not be employed by the school system for the year 1965-66. She then attempted to start a pre-nursery school in South Los Angeles. Mrs. Henry rented a building, ren-



ovated it herself and built many of the furnishings.

With the help of ICBO she was able to secure a license from the state. The local Council also provided her with a battery of consultants, headed by Jerry T. Hodges, a Public Accountant, and Miss June Marshall, Program Director of the Brin Nursery School, to assist her in securing proper financing. The consultants helped her to obtain a loan from the Jewish Free Loan Agency and to apply for a loan from the Economic Development Agency.

In addition to creating a potentially profitable enterprise, Mrs. Henry has provided a safe play area for children from surrounding neighborhoods. This in turn has freed many mothers for part and full-time jobs they otherwise would not have been free to take.

#### Cosmetics manufacturing

Leonard Alexander has been manufacturing cosmetics for five years. In March 1965, he approached the Interracial Council for technical and financial guidance in expanding his business.

Thomas L. McGowan of the Chase Manhattan Bank, was assigned to consult with Mr. Alexander. They spent the first three months of their association building distribution and sales in New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and the Caribbean area, collecting past due receivables and creating a presentation containing the leading products in the line.

By the end of August, Mr. Alexander's sales had trebled. The profit for the quarter ending September 30 was equal to his company's entire profit for 1964.

At the request of Mr. McGowan, ICBO Consultant E. G. Spaulding, an accountant at International Basic Economy Corporation, agreed to assist Mr. Alexander in setting up a bookkeeping system and developing an accurate and full financial picture of his business.

Mr. Alexander has been able to pay off all of his debts, increase his profits and substantially improve his working capital position without any borrowing whatsoever.

Mr. McGowan is continuing to work with Mr. Alexander to bring the company's sales and profits to a level which can support additional management and sales personnel. In fact, Mr. Alexander already has been able to employ a student, part-time, to handle increased orders. Messrs. McGowan and Alexander are now concentrating on the expansion of the business in the Caribbean area, development of Eastern markets, and a new advertising and promotion campaign.

#### Retail drug chain

When Lawrence Thompson and Robert Anderson first visited the Interracial Council in January 1965, they, along with Henry Williams, owned four retail drug stores and wanted to buy another. They had built up a growing business in less than 10 years and wanted to continue their expansion program.

Samuel Sadin, President of Seaway Lumber Sales Corporation and a director of the New York ICBO, was assigned to the problem as ICBO consultant. The client/consultant team worked together to set up an employee training program for the stores, supplier relationships were strengthened, store operations were tightened up generally, and more detailed record keeping was instituted.

At this point, it was determined that they had a shortage of working capital and that it would be advisable to consolidate their existing businesses and defer expansion. To this end, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Thompson sold one of their four stores and invested the capital from the sale in the other stores.

By the end of June, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Thompson, in consultation with Mr. Sadin, determined that approximately \$35,000 would be needed in the form of a long-term loan

in order to refinance properly their existing debts.

Mr. Sadin met with the clients and their accountant for the purpose of preparing the financial statements needed for a loan application. The clients then applied for a loan from Freedom National Bank with SBA participation. In December, the loan was approved.

The three pharmacies owned by Messrs. Anderson, Thompson and Williams are now operating profitably. Plans are being formulated for expansion. Mr. Sadin will continue to consult with them in the execution of these plans.

#### INTERRACIAL COUNCIL FOR BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY

##### National Board of Directors

Co-Chairman, \*Rodman C. Rockefeller, Vice President, International Basic Economy Corporation; \*Harvey C. Russell, Vice President, Planning, Pepsi-Cola Company.

President, \*William R. Hudgins, President, Freedom National Bank.

Chairman, Executive Committee, \*Albert C. Lasher, Director of Corporate Relations, Lily-Tulip Cup Corporation.

Treasurer, \*Robert L. Wechsler, Executive Vice President, Philip Wechsler & Son, Inc. Secretary, \*Alan S. Rosenberg, Proskauer Rose Goetz & Mendelsohn, Esqs.

\*Nelson Bengston, President, Bengston & Company, Inc.

Joseph E. Booker, Jr., Assistant Manager, Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.

†Dr. Courtney C. Brown, Dean, Graduate School of Business Administration, Columbia University.

†Victor M. Carter, President, Republic Corporation.

†Miss Evelyn Cunningham, Staff Associate to the Governor, State of New York.

†Dr. Clifford C. Davis, Chairman of the Board, Riverton Laboratories, Inc.

Joseph E. Davis, President, Carver Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Irving C. Dwork, President, Franlee Distributors, Inc.

†H. Naylor Fitzhugh, Vice President, Special Markets, Pepsi-Cola Company.

Joseph Gerofsky, President, Gerofsky Brothers Company, Inc.

Hon. Harrison J. Goldin, New York State Senate.

\*Carter F. Henderson, Manager, Public Affairs Analysis, International Business Machines Corporation.

†Norman O. Houston, President, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Albert E. Jeffcoat, Director of Communications, Celanese Corporation of America.

††Mrs. Naomi B. Levine, Squadron & Plesent, Esqs.

\*Stanley D. Levison, Esq.

Horace E. Manacher, President, Central Petroleum Corporation.

\*Lyle A. Marshall, Marshall & MacDevitt, Esqs.

†Will Maslow, Executive Director, American Jewish Congress.

†Robert Grayson McGuire, Jr., President, McGuire Funeral Service.

\*Mrs. G. G. Michelson, Vice President, Personnel, Macy's New York.

Amram E. Nowak, President, Amram Nowak Associates, Inc.

†Everett P. O'Neal, President, O'Neal Tire Company.

†Henry G. Parks, Jr., President, H. G. Parks, Inc.

John T. Patterson, National Director, Interracial Council for Business Opportunity.

†Dore Schary, National Chairman, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Robert J. Schwartz, Senior Pension Fund Portfolio Specialist, Bache & Co., Inc.

\*Tom L. Sims, Vice President, Marketing, McCann-Erickson, Inc.

Howard M. Squadron, Squadron & Plesent, Esqs.

Hope R. Stevens, Stevens & Murray, Esqs.

\*Charles T. Williams, Vice President, Schenley Distillers Company.

†Seymour D. Wolf, President, American Wholesalers, Inc.

†Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League, Inc.

May 27, 1966.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
Interracial Council for Business Opportunity,  
New York, N.Y.:

We have examined the accompanying consolidated statements of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity as follows:

Net assets—December 31, 1965.  
Income and expenditures and changes in net assets—year ended December 31, 1965.

Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards applicable to cash basis statements, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The records of the Council are maintained on a cash basis. Consequently, amounts are not included in income until received, and expenses are not recorded until paid. Cash receipts were accepted as shown by the records, and the amounts so shown were tested checked to the bank accounts.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly the consolidated net assets of the Council at December 31, 1965, arising from cash transactions and the revenues collected and expenditures made by the Council during the year then ended.

TOUCHE, ROSS, BAILEY & SMART,  
Certified Public Accountants.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Interracial Council for Business Opportunity,  
statement of consolidated net assets, Dec.  
31, 1965

Assets:	
Cash (includes \$99,103.29 in savings accounts).....	\$124,618.20
Deposits .....	660.00
Total .....	125,278.20
Less payroll taxes withheld from employees.....	3,009.65

Net assets, Dec. 31, 1965... 122,268.55

(See "Notes to financial statements.")

Interracial Council for Business Opportunity,  
statement of consolidated income and expenditures and changes in net assets, year ended Dec. 31, 1965

Income:	
Grants and contributions (note 1) .....	\$193,000.10
Luncheons .....	1,128.00
Interest .....	1,752.14
Total income.....	195,880.24

Expenses:	
Salaries .....	51,323.42
Payroll taxes.....	1,251.34
Rent and other occupancy expenses.....	3,717.52
Travel and related expenses.....	4,244.70
Conferences and related expenses.....	1,208.24
Telephone .....	2,716.42
Office equipment .....	3,580.85
Annual report, printing and office supplies.....	5,732.27
Professional fees .....	2,306.00
Fund raising activities.....	2,032.92

\*Members of the executive committee.

†Elected April 20, 1966.

††Elected June 7, 1966.



*Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, statement of consolidated income and expenditures and changes in net assets, year ended Dec. 31, 1965—Continued*

**Expenses—Continued**

Postage .....	\$1,278.65
Organization expense .....	575.00
Miscellaneous .....	787.59

Total expenses .....	80,754.92
----------------------	-----------

Excess of income over expenses .....	115,125.32
Net assets, Jan. 1, 1965 .....	7,143.23

Net assets, Dec. 31, 1965 ..	122,268.55
------------------------------	------------

(See "Notes to financial statements.")

**[Notes to financial statements]**

(1) During the year ended December 31, 1965, the Ford Foundation granted \$300,000.00 to the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity to be paid over a 3-year period beginning in 1965. The first installment of \$100,000.00 was received in 1965. Another donor contributed \$10,000.00, to be paid in five equal installments beginning with \$2,000.00 received during the year ended December 31, 1965.

(2) The local offices in Newark, New Jersey and Los Angeles, California commenced operations in June of 1965. Operations of these two offices have been combined with the New York and National Offices in this report. An office in Washington, D.C. was opened early in February, 1966.

(3) At December 31, 1965 there were unpaid items of approximately \$1,800.00.

**NATIONAL OFFICE**

John T. Patterson, National Director, Room 400, 110 East 23rd Street, New York 10010, Phone 777-3190

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

**Los Angeles**

Co-Chairmen, Victor M. Carter, President, Republic Corporation.

Norman O. Houston, President, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co.

ICBO of Los Angeles, Suite 202/3757 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif./213 388-1226.

**Newark**

Co-Chairmen, Dr. Clifford C. Davis, Chairman of the Board, Riverton Laboratories, Inc.

Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Meyner & Wiley, Esqs.

ICBO of Greater Newark, Suite 716/24 Commerce Street, Newark, N.J./201 622-1388.

**New York**

Co-Chairmen, Steering Committee, Lyle A. Marshall, Marshall & MacDevitt, Esqs.

Samuel Sadin, President, Seaway Lumber Sales Corporation.

ICBO of New York, Suite 300/110 East 33 Street, N.Y., N.Y./674-3120.

**Washington, D.C.**

Co-Chairmen, Organizing Committee, Robert Grayson McGuire, Jr., President, McGuire Funeral Service.

Seymour D. Wolf, President, American Wholesalers, Inc.

ICBO of Greater Washington, 2622 Georgia Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C./202 462-7770.

ICBO is a non-profit tax exempt organization.

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1966]  
**COUNCIL SPURRING NEGRO BUSINESSES—INTER-RACIAL GROUP PROVIDES GUIDANCE FOR CONCERNS**

(By Thomas A. Johnson)

Two years ago Miss Shirley Jordan, a talented dress designer, had a small retail business in a Negro neighborhood and an uncertain future. Today she is a dress manufac-

turer serving scores of retail outlets that include Henri Bendel and the Corduroy Corner.

It was know-how that made the difference. Miss Jordan applied early in 1965 for guidance from the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, a private organization of volunteer business executives and technicians.

The council assigned Benjamin Frank, president of Corduroy Corner, a retail women's apparel store, as Miss Jordan's business consultant and the modern-day Horatio Alger story started to take shape.

**EXPERIENCED EYE**

Mr. Frank first disagreed with Miss Jordan's plans to expand her own retail business. His experienced eye saw that Miss Jordan's skill should compete with that of other designers and not be restricted to one outlet. He also helped by outlining price policies, bookkeeping, and several other small points of business learned from experience.

An article in Women's Wear Daily outlined Miss Jordan's growing business and new accounts followed. Miss Jordan said in the article that she probably would not be in business today had it not been for "the help, guidance, encouragement and advice obtained from the interracial council."

The council, in an advance copy of its annual report for 1965, stated that 270 businessmen-consultants had advised 470 Negro small-business persons during the year. While not all their efforts were as dramatically successful as the case of Miss Jordan, the report said the council helped several businesses get started and helped put others on a sound footing.

**PURPOSE OF GROUP**

It was formed in October 19— by the Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress and the Urban League of Greater New York and its purpose is "to strengthen and encourage a sense of independence and strength in the Negro communities by the development of Negro-owned and operated business enterprises throughout the country."

The national board of directors include 40 white and Negro business and professional men including Rodman C. Rockefeller, eldest son of the Governor, and Harvey C. Russell, a vice president of the Pepsi Cola Company. Mr. Russell is a Negro.

The council's annual report shows that only a small percentage of businesses in America are Negro-owned and that this has hindered the Negro's "ascension, except as an employee. This confinement within a stagnating one-class social group creates severe resentments and frustrations destroying natural motivation and initiative."

"The I.C.B.O. is not a civil rights organization, in the usual sense of that term," the report said. "We are, of course, concerned with human rights, but the council believes that there is too often a wide-open gap between legal rights and genuine economic opportunity. Our mission is to make those rights mean something in practical, economic terms."

In 1965 the council was the recipient of a \$300,000 grant from the Ford Foundation, to be paid over a three-year period. Council spokesmen hope that this grant would help with the counseling of about 3,400 Negro entrepreneurs.

The national offices of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity are situated at 110 East 23d Street, and for a time represented the only council location. Today, however, there are offices in Newark, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles, where an office was opened a week after the riots in Watts ended last August. There are plans to open additional offices in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Atlanta and Boston.

Additional case histories in the report for 1965 showed that business executives had given varied assistance to Negro small-business men in similar fields. George King, of Restaurant Associates, Inc., which operates the Four Seasons and Mama Leone's, was one consultant mentioned.

Mr. King, along with consultants Gregory Moses, a certified public accountant, and Herbert Lifschitz, a lawyer, helped former candy-store operator Preston Lambert secure a Small Business Administration loan and open a Chicken Delight store.

A Los Angeles mother of four was assisted in starting a nursery school by two consultants from the council, one an accountant and the other the program director for another nursery school. And the owners of a chain of four small retail drugstores were helped to tighten their administrative areas, increase sales and refinance existing debts.

Thomas L. McGowan of the Chase Manhattan Bank was assigned to consult with cosmetics manufacturer Leonard Alexander. Mr. McGowan's advice was to build distribution and sales in New York, Pennsylvania and the Caribbean; collect past due receipts and create a presentation containing the leading products in the line.

"By the end of August," the report said, "Mr. Alexander's sales had trebled. The profit for the quarter ended Sept. 30 [1965] was equal to his company's entire profit for 1964."

**EDITORIAL ON AN ANTIPOVERTY COMSAT**

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an editorial in the August 15, 1966, Economic Opportunity Report, an independent weekly newsletter on economic opportunity programs, supports the Economic Opportunity Corporation which I have proposed as a private-enterprise addition to the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[An Economic Opportunity Report editorial, Aug. 15, 1966]

**A WAR ON POVERTY COMSAT?**

The desperate needs of the poor in this nation demand that all resources available be mobilized to fight the War on Poverty. The time has now come to "escalate" this war, and with Vietnam continuing to demand so much money, it is time for the Federal government to search for other means to channel funds into our embattled slums.

The one area which, so far at least, has been overlooked is the private sector—the resources of private individuals, industry, labor unions, and foundations. Hundreds of millions are already being spent from this area to fight poverty in the form of charity. But there are still greater resources which could be tapped if the Federal government would lead the way.

Toward this end Senator Jacob JAVITS has proposed an amendment to the EO Act that would establish an Economic Opportunity Corporation to be owned jointly by the Federal government and the general public. The concept is modeled after ComSat, the Communications Satellite Corporation, because that company represents a unique and highly successful effort to enlist private resources and the vigor of private capitalism into a government-sponsored corporation with the objective of performing a governmental function. Backed by the government, ComSat was rapidly over-subscribed by private investors and, since it began

operation, has shown the ingenuity of private enterprise. The Senator's proposal seeks to achieve the same ends in the War on Poverty.

The EOC would issue \$1 billion in stock, of which the government would purchase 40 percent and the public, 60 percent. It would be run by a nine-member Board of Directors with 5 members elected by the public stockholders and 4 (including one representative of the poor) appointed by the President. With \$1 billion to expend on limited-profit projects, the EOC could be an important source of new funds. Further, it could afford to go into areas where the OEO has so far been reluctant to enter. Take manpower training, for example. The company might contract with industries in a certain area to provide a training pool for technical and sub-professional occupations. This type of arrangement could provide high-caliber training tailored exactly to the needs of local businesses. Graduates would be virtually assured jobs, and present training costs to industry would be lowered.

An even more significant field might be that of low-income housing. Although there have been a few tentative experiments by private industry in this area, the housing industry generally has shown no interest in providing decent housing for those on limited incomes. Several projects recently have proposed interesting answers in this area, such as slum rehabilitation and management projects on a large scale, and construction of suburban low-income housing for ghetto residents. These are just a few of the desperately needed, but profitable, projects which a large, private, profit-making corporation could initiate.

Economic Opportunity Report feels that the Economic Opportunity Corporation, or some similar type of organization, is badly needed and merits the consideration of the Congress and the support of those involved in the War on Poverty.

### THE TRAGEDY OF WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Jack Kofoed has written a sound and moving article about his son and the war in Vietnam. I recommend it to all Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article by Jack Kofoed, entitled "Don't Let Anything Happen to Him, God."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACK KOFOED SAYS: "DON'T LET ANYTHING HAPPEN TO HIM, GOD"

It was our Jack's birthday last Thursday. If he had lived he would have been 41 years old. He was with the Sixth Marine Division on Okinawa when he was 19, a six-foot, three-inch boy with blond hair and blue eyes, a corporal and expert rifleman. Jack had a flair for language, and he quickly learned a good deal of Okinawan.

Frightened peasants holed up in caves whenever they could, fearful the white devils would murder them. Because Jack could communicate, he'd edge into caves, bayonetted rifle at ready. He'd speak quietly, telling the peasants to come out and they wouldn't be harmed. He saved a lot of lives that way since battle-tough Marines might spray a cave with machine guns or liquid fire because Japanese hid in caves and were quick with grenades.

Jack's wife gave birth to a girl and he received a letter about it from her. His company commander said he was the happiest kid in the world at the news. That night he went on patrol with fellow Leathernecks. A Japanese sniper got our boy in his sights

... and that's all there was. There wasn't any more.

That was 21 years ago last April. His daughter, Karen, has grown up and married, Jack wasn't given much of life, but he made a great deal of what was vouchsafed him.

Whenever I read about Viet Nam I think of our boy who lies in the Punchbowl, a national cemetery in Hawaii. Even more I think of the mothers and fathers of Marines and soldiers who are fighting in Viet Nam. I know how they wake in the night in a sweat of fear. Their hearts tighten. They wonder and fear and prayers form on their lips. Please, God, they whisper, don't let anything happen to him!

But things do happen... and there are 70 telegrams one week, 165 another, more and more. Each tells parents the boy they brought into the world and loved and nurtured will never see the sunlight again... that the years in which he might have achieved success have been taken away. And from the parents has been taken what they cared for most in life.

For what?

Mr. Johnson tells us this war is to contain communism in Asia, which it can't do because even Mr. Johnson admits Red drives may blaze up in Thailand, Laos or in any of a number of other places.

At least, the war in which Jack died was sparked by the attack on Pearl Harbor and the destruction of our Pacific fleet. The Japs bragged... and they meant it... that they'd dictate terms in Washington. We felt that prod of self-defense. There never has been any such element in Viet Nam. They were fighting in that country long before the men who're dying there now even heard of the place.

War is useless and creates new problems to replace those supposedly settled by death and destruction. We fought against Fascists and Nazis, with Communists on our side, 20 years or so ago. Now, the one-time Fascists and Nazis are our allies, and Communists our foes.

For instance, we have made Japan one of the most prosperous nations on the face of the earth, so of what use was the final sacrifice Jack made in the service of his country? Or that of the sniper who killed him, and who probably was killed a little later by a Marine sharpshooter.

The great hurt has gone. Time has healed that, but not the wonder as to why mankind continues slaughtering the best of its young men in battle. That war solves nothing is proved by the fact that the world is continuously at war.

I have written of this because every day mothers and fathers face the stark horror of what Marie and I went through. Years from now, when your grief has become a sad memory, you'll feel for other mothers and fathers (youngsters now), who'll live the same tragedy you're experiencing.

We have never learned, and it doesn't seem we ever will, and those who call themselves God's children will go on murdering each other until the end of time. And, don't think you're alone in your grief. Though the Viets are the enemy, mothers and fathers among them weep just as bitterly as you do when sons of the household lie dead.

### SINGLE THINK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, one of the most discriminating and intelligent journalists in Washington is Miss Inez Robb. She has long commented on the American scene with great understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD her article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 27, 1966, entitled,

"'Single Think' Now Replaces the Consensus."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SINGLE THINK" NOW REPLACES THE CONSENSUS

(By Inez Robb)

Once more we Americans have jumped the gun—or, rather, are running ahead of schedule.

In "1984," George Orwell's novel, "double think" had become the way of life in that climactic year. In the United States, 18 years ahead of schedule, "single think," a more refined version of "double think," is now in being.

The old goal of national consensus has now been changed to command conformity, of "single think." In Chicago last week, President Johnson, in a speech before a Cook County Democratic fund-raising dinner, not only asked an end to criticism of the Administration's Viet Nam policy but appeared to question the patriotism of any critic of that policy.

### THE VOICE OF BARRY?

On that same night, President Johnson's opponent in the 1964 Presidential campaign, Barry Goldwater, also made a political speech in Chicago. I was halfway thru the Johnson speech before I realized I wasn't reading the Goldwater pronouncement.

I toyed with the idea of picketing the White House, but I am ill-equipped for the protest movement since I do not play the guitar or scorn the hairdresser.

For a day or two, I even thought of standing outside the White House, waiting for the exit of the Commander in Chief, so I could cry, "Say it ain't so, Mr. President. Say it ain't so!"

Say it ain't so that the honest dissent of honest men and honorable critics, no matter how irritating personally, is now equated with disloyalty.

Say it ain't so that "single think" is Administration policy, throwing the nation back into another McCarthy era when a man, at his peril, disagrees with the power elite.

### LOYALTY TEST

Say it ain't so that Americans must remain mute when their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor have been pledged to the support of arrogant, wholly unreliable, pipsqueek Vietnamese generals. Surely the great test of loyalty is not the ability to love or admire or back Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky. Because if it is, a vast number of 100 percent, true-blue Americans are going to flunk it.

Say it ain't so that this great democracy is subtly being transformed into a military oligarchy wherein the Commander in Chief is President by right of military office and not vice versa, as provided for in the Constitution.

These are great days for THINK in Washington. On the same day the President spoke in Chicago, Secretary of State Rusk made a statement in the capital to the effect that the natives are restless—in the United States.

### MATTER OF LABEL

They are restless, Mr. Rusk has finally discovered, because of the inability of the South Vietnamese to get together and fight the Viet Cong instead of each other. Multitudes of Americans may feel that Mr. Rusk is lagging only in his discovery and his seeming unwillingness to apply the proper name, civil war, to the chaotic situation in Viet Nam.

It has taken Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara five and one-half years in office to discover that the draft is neither fair nor equitable; that it is, in fact, damnably unfair and inequitable.



The President is opposed to the McNamara suggestion of drafting youth for two years of national service in civilian tasks, should military service prove too onerous for draft-card burners. Thus, Mr. McNamara flunks the "single think" test and what happens to him now?

The late New York Mayor La Guardia used to say that when he made a mistake, it was a beaut. But he was a Republican, and thus subject to error.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE PEACE CORPS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3418) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, S. 3418 as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations should occasion little debate and controversy in the Senate.

It authorizes the appropriation of \$110 million for the fiscal year 1967 operations of the Peace Corps and makes other minor changes in the basic act. The amount recommended compares to an authorization of \$115 million and an appropriation of \$114,100,000 for fiscal year 1966.

At the same time, the Peace Corps plans a reasonable expansion of activities from 14,800 volunteers abroad or in training at present to 16,000 by the end of the 1967 program year. This expansion will be financed by various savings being made in Peace Corps allowances and costs, for which the Peace Corps is to be commended. The average annual cost per volunteer which was \$9,074 in 1963, has decreased to \$7,853 in 1966 and a further decrease to \$7,631 is estimated in 1967.

One cost component in which there will be little savings is training. The committee has from the beginning recognized that the success of the Peace Corps would depend largely on the care exercised in selection and the adequacy of training. Training costs have risen from \$2,447 per volunteer in 1963 to \$3,739 in 1966 and will decrease to \$3,538 in 1967. In spite of that fact the training period will be lengthened from an average of 11 weeks to 12 weeks.

There are several other amendments to the act approved by the committee. One will authorize the Peace Corps to extend its school-to-school partnership program to countries and areas in which the Peace Corps has no programs. Another will authorize the Peace Corps to employ counsel and pay legal fees and other costs related to the defense of volunteers who are made parties to foreign judicial or administrative proceedings. The committee added a separate section, suggested by Senator JORDAN of North Carolina, to make clear that this authority can be used retroactively. The committee also continued for fiscal year 1967 the ceiling on research of \$500,000. There are additional minor technical amendments involved in S. 3418, which are fully explained in the committee report.

I do want to discuss briefly the Exchange Peace Corps which had been proposed by the administration as part of this bill. The committee discussed this

proposal at two separate meetings but decided for the time being to strike it from the bill. It was the view of the committee that this idea needed further refinement and detail before the committee would be in a position to pass on its merits and that, in any case, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act contained authority, particularly in section 102(b)(5), to undertake such a program if the administration deems it desirable. The committee's action therefore, was no out-of-hand rejection of this proposal but a desire to have a clear idea of how it would work and authorities do exist to determine this, if a decision is made to use them. Concomitant with its action, the committee reduced the executive branch authorization request by approximately the amount which was to be allotted to the Exchange Peace Corps program.

About the Peace Corps generally, it has passed another year of handling itself well and of being a credit to the United States and the men and women who participate in it. On behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations I recommend that the Senate pass S. 3418.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] sometimes has a way of saying very important and significant things so quietly that they are overlooked. I would hope that the Senator would emphasize the fact that what the committee did was in the exercise of prudent judgment and not a turndown of the basic idea. On the contrary, the committee considers itself to be seized with the basic idea and sees the possibilities in it, and through the executive branch hopes it will pursue the matter so that something can really be made of it. I think it is important that we do not spurn that kind of possibility but treat it as the Senator has described in his presentation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. What he says is very largely the case. In addition, it is believed that the Peace Corps Director agrees that for the preliminary project it is highly feasible. So there is existing authority under existing law for the pilot project, but it had authority to go far beyond that. There is no doubt that this is the prudent way to proceed, and the Director agrees.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. But by this turndown, it will not inhibit him, will it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not under existing authority of another law.

Mr. JAVITS. Fine. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have been around the world a great deal, especially in Latin America, and I must say that I really glow with pride over the Peace Corps. There are some projects which do not measure up to their practices, but there are many difficulties and, I will admit, a certain amount of boondoggling, but it is really minimal in this case.

I wish the Senator had been with me in the uplands of Peru, for example, to have seen six young American girls oper-

ating Peru's Indian villages, located on a great pampas, a very depressing and poor area of that country. How they worked so hard to earn the love and respect of those Indians there is something to make the American soul soar.

We cannot pay enough tribute to the idealism, the patriotism, and the will of these young people. Anything that we can do to add to the approval which our Peace Corps members receive is our fundamental and bounden duty to do. I have seen the Peace Corps work in Latin American countries in barrios, in slums, as well as in Indian villages. I have seen them work in other parts of the world, in the Far East and on the European Continent, and I have only the highest feeling of satisfaction that they are Americans and represent the youth of our land.

I would feel deeply remiss as a Senator if I failed to join the Senator in paying our Peace Corps volunteers the most eloquent tribute possible in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very glad that the Senator has expressed himself as he has. I quite agree with what he says. One would have to go to see them in all these places to know that they have become successful, because there have been so few complaints from any countries as to the administration or the actual participation in the program.

I quite agree with the Senator that this is one of the few programs that I take pride in, in contrast to some others, in which our libraries have been burned down and we have been condemned generally.

The Peace Corps is a great success, I am happy to agree with the Senator. I agree with everything he says about the Peace Corps. Its great success, I am sure, will continue.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say that the Peace Corps has received as few complaints as any agency of Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is like the exchange program. There have been very few complaints about it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Arkansas is very proud of that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To me, that is very much the same thing.

Mr. AIKEN. The exchange program, however, is not an agency of the Government. I do not know who runs it, but he is doing an excellent job, and the program does work.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Charles Frankel is its present head. He is Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. While we are taking a little "ease" here, let me tell the Senator from Arkansas that I am trying another idea for size, somewhat on the reverse order of the Fulbright scholarships. That is to make available funds from hard currency in return for soft currency for students to study in this country from countries which have soft currency which would be useful to us.

We could start that as a kind of modest program in the hope that it would encourage more foreign student activity of a desirable kind in the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank both Senators from New York and Vermont for their comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Peace Corps legislation which we have just passed in this body without dissent has become an institution of great prestige in our country—and justly so. Under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas, the eminent chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the full force and effect of the original concept and design of the program has never been untracked. The fact that the bill passes without dissent is a testimonial to the soundness of the program as well as to the confidence of the Senate in the product of the Foreign Relations Committee and its chairman.

Equally high commendation is to be afforded to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for his cooperation and assistance within the committee and on the floor in assuring this expeditious action today.

The Senate as a whole is indebted to these men and to all members of the committee for their effort, in assuring this swift passage today.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS—MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business? Has permission been given to lay down the minimum wage as the pending bill, after consideration of the Peace Corps bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but it has not been reported yet. There is no pending business at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action on the minimum wage bill will be taken until tomorrow.

I have been informed by the ranking member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that all the reports on

the minimum wage bill will be on the desks of Senators tomorrow.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

#### ORDER OF ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, these requests which I have just made have all been cleared with the minority leader.

#### OF TIME AND THE RIVER—ARIZONA'S FUTURE AT STAKE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, "Of Time and the River" was the title given by the late Thomas Wolfe to a major novel of the 20th century. In a few words that phrase expresses the hope and concern of Arizona today—hope for the river and concern that time is running out.

The river I want to discuss today is the Colorado—and to the people of Arizona, there is no other river. The Colorado is to the citizens of my State as the Jordan is to the people of Israel, or the Nile to the people of Egypt. It is to the Colorado that we must look for our salvation.

In the arid sweep of the vast Southwest, water literally is salvation—and, for us, there is no other salvation but the Colorado.

The river is there, timeless and renewable. Of time for Arizona, however, there is precious little remaining.

There is neither time nor any need for me to recite the long and often turbulent history of Colorado River development and its vital role in the expanding economy of the entire Rocky Mountain-Pacific Southwest region.

Many Senators know that story well, and there are none who know it so intimately as my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is the dean not only of the Senate but of Colorado River authorities as well.

Beginning with the first giant step of Hoover Dam, he has been personally involved in every piece of legislation that made possible the modern miracles of productive farms and gleaming new cities in the Southwest.

I can assure the Senate that my esteemed senior colleague concurs in the remarks I want to make today about pending legislation which is so urgently needed to achieve the maximum beneficial use of the water of the Colorado.

We have introduced legislation in the form of S. 75 to accomplish that objective. Meanwhile, similar legislation re-

flecting an unprecedented unity of approach on the part of virtually all representatives of Colorado River Basin States is progressing in the other body.

After extensive hearings and searching review, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has reported an amended version of H.R. 4671, the Colorado River Basin Project Act.

It is my earnest hope that a bill embodying essential features of an acceptable and workable Colorado River project, including the long-overdue central Arizona project, will soon be adopted by the House and sent to the Senate. That is why I want to further acquaint Members of the Senate with some of the recent and admittedly confusing developments related to this complex legislative effort.

In all humility, and yet with the firm conviction that Arizona's position in this matter is just and right, I must respond to the extraordinary campaign of deceit and falsehood that is being waged against further development of the resources of the Colorado River.

As so often happens, truth was the first casualty in this propaganda war against dams on the Colorado. And when the truth is obscured, it is far easier for emotion to overcome reason.

All I ask of my colleagues in the Congress is a willingness to consider the facts in open competition with deliberate deception.

First, I want to recount briefly why and how this legislation evolved. Then I shall comment in some detail about the misguided efforts of a tiny privileged minority to wreck the legitimate aspirations of 30 million Americans who live in the 7 Colorado River Basin States.

For as long as I can remember, Mr. President, the Colorado River was a source of hostility rather than harmony among those who laid claim to its water and power potential.

Nowhere was this enmity more bitter and divisive than between Arizona and California.

One after another, the great works approved by Congress began harnessing the river and spreading its benefits—first to the burgeoning communities of southern California and later to projects in the upper basin States.

Arizona watched with a mixture of envy and anticipation for the time when we, too, could put our rightful share of the river to practical use.

Our disputes with California notwithstanding, we remained devoted to the fundamental reclamation concept—and with good reason. Arizona in general, and the Phoenix area in particular, would not be among the fastest growing locations in the Nation today without the assured but limited water supply provided by the Salt River project—the pioneering pace setter of all reclamation projects.

After World War II, Arizona twice came to the Congress with a feasible project to bring its share of Colorado River water into the central valleys where it was, even then, so badly needed.

Twice—in 1950 and again in 1951—it was approved by the Senate and sent to



the House. Both times it ran afoul of the old Arizona-California feud and doubts about the validity of Arizona's water rights.

In passing, it is interesting to note that those central Arizona project bills of 15 years ago clearly provided for a dam at Bridge Canyon—the same dam that today has aroused such belated hysteria in Sierra Club headquarters.

At this juncture, and with a declining groundwater table assuming threatening proportion, Arizona was forced into long and expensive litigation to perfect its rights to main-stream Colorado River water.

The U.S. Supreme Court in 1963 settled any doubts about Arizona's rights once and for all. In large measure our original claim was upheld.

In short, we gained a handsome paper decree stating that we had a right to some water at the bottom of a mile-deep gorge 200 miles from where it was needed.

Even while we were stymied by years of litigation, Arizona did not turn its back on the growing needs of its neighbors.

In good faith—and because it was the right thing to do—Arizona's representatives in the Congress of both parties gave their wholehearted support to the upper Colorado River project and helped achieve its passage.

Today the Nation has Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Powell—one of the truly magnificent bodies of water in the world—a lake that enriches the esthetic and recreational opportunities of millions of Americans for generations to come.

Moreover, farms and cities in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming can look forward to an increased measure of stability and economic growth because of the related projects made possible by Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Powell.

Having won its case in court, Arizona then renewed its struggle to translate rights on paper into water on the land.

It was during this period, Mr. President, that I became officially involved in this matter. As one who was privileged to serve three terms as Governor of Arizona, I can testify from experience to the mounting frustration in our State and the growing anxiety over continued delays in attacking our water deficiency problem.

Many of us felt at the time—as we do even more so today—that Arizona simply cannot afford to gamble any longer with its future.

We had kept the faith with our sister States in the basin. We had waited patiently while their projects were authorized and constructed, and we pitched in to help.

We had done everything the Congress asked us to do—but we still had no water.

A realistic political appraisal of our prospects for action in Congress afforded us little if any encouragement.

We desperately needed a new and higher level of statesmanship applied to the problem.

As a westerner I am proud to say that the political and citizen leadership of the

Colorado River Basin States has proved equal to the challenge.

We faced our problems and our differences squarely. We spent countless hours in exploratory meetings searching for the common ground we realized was mandatory.

Throughout this tedious and often discouraging process we enjoyed the firm support and cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I cannot begin to mention all of the individuals and organizations in the various States who have contributed so much to this continuing joint enterprise. All of them deserve credit for their perseverance and courage.

We have learned it is possible for men of good will to transcend old, static ways of thinking about water in terms only of local advantage and State boundaries.

In the time-tested American tradition, Members of the other body have managed to hammer out a unified approach through honorable compromise—a compromise in which Arizona has made many concessions.

The principles and objectives remain the same—maximum possible development of all resources of the Colorado River to provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

It is possible to accomplish this in a manner consistent with engineering and fiscal feasibility—and make no mistake about this, with a due regard for the preservation of our natural heritage.

The old central Arizona project has been incorporated into an expanded but eminently practical plan affecting the entire basin—an area, let me remind the Senate, that comprises about one-twelfth of the continental United States, excluding Alaska, and includes the southern portion of the most populous State in the Union.

The wisdom of this approach was recognized and accepted by one group after another.

Investor-owned utilities and public power agencies are together on it. Business groups and organized labor support it. City councils and State legislatures are behind it.

Politically, there are no partisan lines here. Democrats and Republicans are playing on the same team. In the half century of reclamation development in the West, there has never been a consensus like this.

In all fairness, Mr. President, I can make the factual statement that the overwhelming majority of people in the seven Colorado River Basin States want this legislation enacted.

That is where we stand today. I urge you to keep this background in mind as I turn now to those few emotional and extreme voices of opposition that have been raised against us.

First, let me make it abundantly clear that I do not question the sincerity of their motives. Nor do I question their constitutional right to be heard.

What I do question—and indeed, challenge—is the factual accuracy of their arguments.

Conservation groups, including the Sierra Club, have a worthy place in our society. Over the years they have con-

tributed much to the wise management and preservation of our natural resources.

Regrettably, in this instance they are just wrong—and I will tell you why.

Your attention has been directed to full-page advertisements appearing in the Washington Post and the New York Times in recent weeks. Some of you have received letters from alarmed and misinformed constituents as a result of this misleading scare campaign.

They would have you believe we want to “flood” or “inundate” the Grand Canyon. There is both a short and long answer to this. The short answer is “Nonsense.”

Now for the longer answer—and unlike the Sierra Club and its executive director, David Brower—I shall confine myself to documented facts.

The main thrust of Mr. Brower's campaign of misrepresentation has been directed against Hualapai Dam at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dam—the two hydroelectric and river-regulating structures that are essential to the entire basin development plan.

I wish it were possible for me to conduct each Member of the Senate on a personal tour of the area and to show exactly where the dams would be and where the lakes would form in relation to Grand Canyon National Park.

This would immediately dispel any apprehension over authorizing the dams. Since that is not possible, I shall rely on official maps, personal observations, and the testimony of those whose firsthand knowledge of the Colorado River is unquestioned.

Hualapai Dam, formerly called Bridge Canyon, would rest in a narrow inner gorge of the river some 80 miles west and downstream of the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. It would be about 150 miles from the El Tovar Hotel on the south rim of the canyon, the area most Americans see when they visit the park.

The 600-foot dam would be at the bottom of an inner gorge that ranges from 1,500 to 2,000 feet deep. This inner gorge in turn is part of the main gorge that is approximately 5,000 feet deep, or about a mile.

The reservoir would back water first along the southern boundary of Lake Mead National Recreational Area and along the northern boundary of the Hualapai Indian Reservation for approximately 53 miles.

The next 27 miles would be along the southern boundary of the Grand Canyon National Monument—not to be confused with the park.

The monument is a relatively small 310-square-mile area adjacent to the park that was established by Presidential proclamation long after the park. Few Americans even know the monument is there—and even fewer have ever visited it.

Last year, for example, only 1,300 persons visited the monument area, compared with an attendance of 3½ million at Lake Mead Recreation Area and more than 1½ million at Grand Canyon Park proper.



The final 13 miles of the lake behind Hualapai Dam, ranging from a depth of 90 feet down to zero, or river level, would follow the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Park.

Presumably, it is this 90 feet of water at the bottom of a mile-deep gorge that the Sierra Club thinks would be a flood.

The copy writer for the Sierra Club's latest ad that appeared in the New York Times of July 25 really got carried away with his rhetoric.

At one point the ad claims that "in some places, the inner gorge will be submerged 500 feet."

Mr. President, this is a patent falsehood. The word "submerge" has a distinct and clear meaning. It means under water.

In the name of commonsense, how could you "submerge" an inner gorge 2,000 feet deep with a lake whose maximum depth behind Hualapai Dam could be only 600 feet?

This is typical of the exaggeration and outright misstatement of fact that characterizes the propaganda of the Sierra Club.

Take another example. The ad calls Hualapai Dam "an unthinkable precedent" and warns of the "demise" of the national park system.

The truth is, of course, that Hualapai Dam is neither "unthinkable" nor a "precedent." It has been thought about for more than 40 years.

The very act that created Grand Canyon National Park in 1919 specifically anticipated a dam at the Bridge Canyon site.

In 1933, when the monument area was added adjacent to the park, the Director of the National Park Service, Horace Albright, wrote a letter directly on this point to the Commissioner of Reclamation. Here is a direct quote from that letter:

As I see it the Bridge Canyon Project is in no way affected by the Grand Canyon National Monument proclamation; we have had it in mind all the time, the Bridge Canyon project.

The Sierra Club ad is not even correct in its mention of Grand Teton.

Jackson Lake at the foot of the Grand Teton range was first a reclamation project. In 1907 the Bureau of Reclamation added a rock dam at the foot of the lake on the Snake River to make possible 200,000 acre-feet of storage for the Minidoka project in Idaho.

The dam was raised in 1911 and again in 1916 to its present height of 78 feet and total storage capacity of 847,000 acre-feet.

It is this beautiful sparkling lake that today enhances the scenery at Grand Teton National Park and affords boating and fishing pleasure for visitors. Water is not withdrawn from the lake during the tourist season except in emergency drought conditions.

But this is not the only precedent. Fontana Dam backs up a scenic lake bordering a portion of the Great Smoky National Park, which annually draws more visitors than any other national park in the system. The same is true of Sherburne Dam and lake in Glacier National Park.

These lakes certainly are not eyesores or threats to the park system. Just the opposite is true. The "precedent" argument, therefore, is totally without factual basis.

The second and smaller of the two dams authorized in H.R. 4671 would be in Marble Canyon. This damsite is 12½ miles upstream from the eastern boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. Its reservoir would have absolutely nothing to do with the Grand Canyon.

The Colorado River would continue to flow undisturbed for the 104-mile stretch from Marble Canyon Dam through the Grand Canyon National Park to the headwaters of Hualapai Lake.

It is true that there would be a slight difference in the appearance of the river. Instead of a muddy reddish brown, it would be a clear blue trout stream.

In the truest and finest sense of the term, this would be conservation, not destruction. It would enhance natural beauty, not destroy it.

Those who had the time, the money and the inclination—including the members of the Sierra Club—could continue to run the river in boats and rafts for the entire course of its passage through the Grand Canyon.

Meanwhile, as opposed to only a few thousand persons who have ever availed themselves of this rare sport, millions of their fellow Americans would also be able to get a close-up view of what is undeniably some of the most spectacular scenery in the world.

Let me emphasize again, Mr. President, that Marble Canyon is not the Grand Canyon. It is not even in what is commonly referred to as the Grand Canyon. It is not even within the boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park.

There are literally hundreds of smaller canyons, intermittent streams and springs that feed into the Colorado River as it bores its way to the Gulf of California. The ecology of all but a handful of them behind Hualapai and Marble Canyon dams would not be disturbed in any way by the lakes.

Believe me, if you could take a helicopter excursion over this stretch of territory you could see there are enough canyons of all sizes and shapes to satisfy all conceivable ecological interest for all time to come.

One final observation about this ridiculous "flooding" argument may assist you in acquiring a proper perspective on what is involved.

Engineers have calculated the volume in acre feet of that 13-mile portion of the lake behind Hualapai Dam that would form the northwestern boundary of Grand Canyon National Park. They have also figured the volume of the entire stretch of the Grand Canyon through the park.

For an accurate comparative illustration, that ratio is equivalent to 1 drop of water in a 50-gallon barrel.

Now I want to mention briefly some additional positive aspects of the case for the dams which you may not have heard or read.

Aside from its hydroelectric peaking power production and silt control func-

tions, Hualapai Dam would provide direct and immediate economic benefits to the most poverty-stricken and disadvantaged segment of our national population.

To the destitute Hualapai Indians on their desolate and barren reservation, Hualapai Lake would mean jobs, income, economic growth opportunities and the prospect of a better life for their children.

It will mean roads across their reservation, a steadily increasing tourist income and a chance to join the mainstream of American society.

In the words of their tribal chairman, George Rocha:

We do not wish to remain isolated in a canyon wilderness just so a few people can play at being brave explorers in the 20th century . . . The building of Hualapai Dam is our only hope for independence and freedom from want.

Although their land would enjoy the greatest direct impact, the Hualapais are not the only Indians who would derive benefits from this project.

Official representatives of six other Arizona Indian tribes have endorsed the building of the dams. They include leaders of the Salt River Pimas and Maricopas, the Gila River Indian Community, the Papagos, the Colorado River tribes, the Yavapais and the White River Apaches.

All told, more than 20,000 Indian citizens in these tribal groups would benefit directly and indirectly. Those benefits range from the alleviation of acute water shortages on Indian lands to the economic potential of tourist income.

The Indians of Arizona know very well what happens to a society when its water supply is diminished or disappears. Around them are the crumbling ruins of their ancestors—including the outline of primitive irrigation structures that can still be seen. They stand as powerful reminders of vanished people—civilizations that withered and died or moved on when the water was gone.

The sad part of Mr. Brower's extreme arguments against this project is the fact that he makes them in the name of conservation.

But let me remind my colleagues that true conservation in the American tradition does not mean the preservation of exclusive privilege for one small group of citizens.

On the contrary, opportunities for the enjoyment of nature and its wonders have been extended to virtually all Americans through the multiple-purpose concept of resource utilization.

All of us know these opportunities must be expanded in light of current and projected population pressures on our available facilities. Hualapai Lake would be a major step in this direction.

Given our experience with Lake Mead and Lake Powell, we know that Hualapai Lake would soon develop into one of the most popular attractions in the Nation.

Lake Mead is a priceless recreational asset because of its proximity to urban centers of the most populous State in the Union and adjacent States. With metropolitan concentrations growing rapidly in



the Southwest, Hualapai Lake—like Lake Powell and Lake Mead today—would be another welcome bonanza for boating, fishing and camping enjoyment.

Public response to Lake Powell, for example, has been amazing, when you consider that it began filling only 3 years ago and visitor facilities are still limited.

Some 196,400 persons visited Lake Powell the first year. Attendance climbed to 303,500 the next year, and as additional accommodations and marina facilities are completed, the figures will climb steadily higher. Already, in the first 7 months of 1966, attendance is reported over the 1965 pace.

There is a curious anomaly in Mr. Brower's propaganda which deserves comment. On behalf of the Sierra Club, he professes to support Arizona's quest for supplemental water. I might say that with friends like this, we do not need enemies.

His ads tell us to forget the dams. They say: "Go ahead and build the central Arizona project and use conventional steam generating plants to provide the necessary pumping energy. Besides, cheap nuclear power is just around the corner."

To the naive and uninformed, this sounds fine. But it just is not true—and wishful thinking cannot change fiction into fact.

I can assure the Senate that the positive economic case for the dams will be documented, and the fallacious arguments against them exposed, as we proceed with the consideration of this project.

For now, I would remind Mr. Brower that steam generating plants require fuel—coal, oil, natural gas—or some form of fissionable material, in the case of nuclear reactors.

All of these, uranium included, are depletable and nonrenewable resources. Their unnecessary use to perform a function that can more efficiently and economically be performed by inexhaustible falling water surely cannot be justified in the name of conservation.

So far, Mr. President, I have not mentioned the unique provision of this legislation which sets it apart from previous reclamation bills. I refer to the long-range need for increased supplies of water in the Colorado River.

Let me assure my friends in the Pacific Northwest that the question of augmenting the water available in the Colorado River at some future date merits objective study by the most competent authorities in our land.

You are perfectly within your rights to demand that this proposal be subjected to the most searching examination—and I have no doubt that it will be.

At this point, let me plead with you not to prejudge the case before the facts are in.

We in Arizona do not covet one drop of somebody else's water which they can put to beneficial consumptive use, either now or in the foreseeable future.

At the same time, we know that the disparity between total supply and predicted demand in the Colorado Basin is

only a reflection of a national, not a local, problem.

The extra water that Phoenix, Tucson, Flagstaff, Williams, Ash Fork, and Casa Grande need today, New York and Washington will need tomorrow.

Experience has taught us that the longer we delay in mounting a coordinated national attack on our water supply and distribution problems, the more difficult and expensive they will be to solve.

Action now to meet our water needs in the year 2000 and beyond is not a visionary step. It is a practical necessity.

Finally, Mr. President, on behalf of Arizona, let me repeat that the river runs on but our time is running out.

It is my earnest hope that the House of Representatives will soon act on the bill reported by its Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and thereby provide the Senate with an opportunity for adequate consideration of this legislation at this session.

Congressional approval of this vitally needed project will usher in a bright new era of progress and prosperity for the entire Colorado River Basin.

For myself and my senior colleague, the beloved President pro tempore of the Senate, we ask only that you make your judgment on this legislation squarely on the basis of the facts that will be presented.

We are perfectly willing to match the combined legal, engineering, and economic recommendations of a quarter-century of study against the desperate distortions of those who represent less than one-hundredth of 1 percent of the American people.

And we have confidence that the Senate, as it has twice before, will make the proper determination.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WORLD OPINION ON U.S. POSITION IN VIETNAM

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I know that all of us have been very interested in listening to the many statements indicating that, so far as world opinion is concerned, our policy in Vietnam is looked at with extreme skepticism, if not with open hostility and criticism.

I was therefore quite interested to read the lead editorial in the current issue, August 20, 1966, of the London Economist entitled "This Is the Third World War."

This is a very excellent editorial. It is one which I think should commend itself to those of us who are concerned with the events in Vietnam. I think it is

also a very strong endorsement in large part of the American position in connection with Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THIS IS THE THIRD WORLD WAR

There is no Mao but Mao, and Lin Piao is his prophet. That is what the past week's events in Peking (see page 719) boil down to. The communiqué from the Chinese communists' central committee at the weekend, followed by the ominously martial rally in Peking on Thursday, with a uniformed Mao Tse-tung presenting his "close friend in combat" Lin Piao to the people, mark out unmistakably the path Mao means China to follow. It was predictable that the central committee, in the sort of words Stalin once made Russians use about him, would duly declare Mao Tse-tung a genius, "the greatest marxist-leninist of our era." After the Mao-organised purges of the last four months, and his baptism in the Yangtze last month, this was inevitable. Like all monopolists of temporal power, from the Roman emperors to Stalin, Mao is spending his last years in arranging to become a god.

What was not inevitable is the emergence of Marshal Lin Piao as China's number two, and the meaning this has for China's foreign policy. The only other Chinese mentioned by name among the ecomiums to Mao in the central committee's communiqué—and twice at that—is Lin Piao. At Thursday's rally in Peking it was Lin Piao who took precedence immediately after Mao himself, before the country's president and prime minister and the communist party's secretary-general. It was Lin Piao who made the main speech under the approving gaze of Chairman Mao. Sick man or not, palely self-effacing or not, the defence minister has risen to the rank of Mao's chief assistant and his successor-apparent. He has done this partly because he can speak for the army, and partly because he has loyally used the army as a guinea-pig for the "cultural revolution" dose of salts with which Mao is now purging the whole country. But Lin Piao has probably risen for another reason too, and this is bad news.

A year ago Lin Piao wrote the famous article, "On People's War," which said that China's foreign policy was to encourage guerrilla wars in the "countryside of the world"—Asia, Africa and Latin America—in order to encircle and destroy the imperialists in the "cities of the world," north America and western Europe. The year that has passed since Lin Piao wrote his article has been a bad one for China's foreign policy, in Indonesia, in Africa and now even in North Korea (see page 721). It would have been reasonable to expect China to whistle its revolutionary tune under its breath this year. Not a bit of it. The central committee has picked out the Lin Piao article for a pat on the back as a scientific analysis of "the world revolution of our time." And Mao has picked out Lin Piao as his chief assistant. The meaning is clear. Mao Tse-tung, now almost mystical in his certainty, is not backing down one inch from his hopes of ideological expansion.

This is the most important fact about Asia today. It is the background against which the debate on American policy in the Far East has to be measured. Whether the United States has a job to do in Asia is not, at bottom, something to be decided in Washington. It has already been decided in Peking. The Americans were a Pacific power long before they became an Atlantic power. In Europe they have generally had a comfort-



ing layer of friendly countries between them and their main potential enemy, Germany or Russia. Across the Pacific there is nothing but cold water. That is why the Americans sent Commodore Perry to Japan a century ago, when all they were asking of Europe was to be left alone by it. It is why they now have virtually no choice but to resist what China is trying to do. No one else can. It will take the other Asians at least a decade to summon up the strength to look after China themselves. The British are still snarled up in the non-sequitur of thinking that belonging to Europe means not belonging to the rest of the world. The Russians took a long step in the right direction at Tashkent this year, when they declared their interest in the stability of the Indian subcontinent; but they have still not been able to bring themselves to say out loud that China's idea of universal revolution is a hell of a way to run the world. They probably will in the end. But meantime the Americans, and the Americans alone, are in a position to do something about the problem-man of the 1960s: Mao the evangelist, with his hot gospel of guerrilla liberation tucked under his arm.

None of this is really in dispute. Mr. Walter Lippmann, the most persistent and intelligent of President Johnson's critics, agrees that it is right for the United States to use its strength to establish a balance of power against the Chinese. The argument is about how much strength will be needed, and where it can best be applied.

It can be argued that in the end the whole business of restraining China's missionary zeal may turn out to be much easier than it looks right now. China is a very poor country indeed. An article on page 720 argues that its chances of ever becoming a rich one, or even of building up a modestly successful industry, are much dimmer than most people have usually assumed. If China does remain a poor country, its hope of inspiring revolutions all around the world will be rationed by the amount of help it can actually send to would-be revolutionaries. And that, to be fair to Mao, is all he aims to do. He is not an expansionist in the sense of wanting to push China's own territory beyond what he considers its historic boundaries. He just wants to spread the good word—but "out of the barrel of a gun." Ten years hence, if China is still too poor to export many guns and many missionaries, Lin Piao's thesis about "the revolution of our time" could look as punctured as President Nasser's grandiose aims of the 1950s look now. This is the optimistic way of looking at things. There is nothing wrong with hoping that the worst will not happen. But it is not a basis for policy. You look so stupid if the worst does come. Until and unless there is solid evidence that China does not intend to do what Lin Piao says it wants to do, or cannot do it, the only safe assumption for the Americans or anybody else to make is that the Chinese mean every word they say. That is where any sober Asia policy starts from.

That is where it starts from. Did it really have to lead to what is happening in Vietnam? Mr. Johnson's critics say that it need not have done. But lately it has looked very much as if some of the steam has been going out of the critics' arguments. This is not because they like this singularly beastly war any better than they used to. Nobody does. It is because, if one leaves aside the marxists and the honourable pacifists, a good many of the critics are finding it increasingly hard to disagree with the basic premise of Mr. Johnson's policy—that it is at present America's job to try to keep China's evangelism under control. Having accepted that, they then find it increasingly hard to suggest any positive alternative to doing it in Vietnam. And every time Mao Tse-tung does

something that seems to justify everybody's worst fears, the critics' job gets that much tougher.

Senator FULBRIGHT, for instance, has not taken direct issue with the policy for Asia that President Johnson spelled out at White Sulphur Springs on July 12th. He preferred to argue that the President ought to have consulted Congress first. It is an argument that would have carried more weight if Mr. Truman had consulted Congress before deciding that the Americans must take over the job of defending Greece and Turkey—the "Truman doctrine"—in 1947. Mr. Lippmann, for his part, has walked into a couple of traps. He tried to argue on July 26th that there is no connection between the guerrilla war in Vietnam ("one small corner of the world") and other possible guerrilla wars that might follow it elsewhere. But Marshal Lin Piao saw the connection all right for China's purposes in the article on "people's war" that the Peking central committee has just commended:

"The people in other parts of the world will see . . . that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too."

That was one trap, and Mr. Lippmann dropped into it. The other is bigger and deeper, and goes right down to the fundamental question about the whole war: how can you defend the non-communist parts of Asia unless you are ready to fight a war in Asia? Mr. Lippmann says, quite rightly, that with the single exception of Korea in 1950 the United States has always avoided land wars in Asia like the plague. So he argues that the Americans should discharge their responsibility to the Asians by means of sea and air power alone—which means, in effect, by air power deployed from aircraft carriers and from islands off the Asian mainland. But Mr. Lippmann himself has scathingly pointed out how limited the uses of air power have been in Vietnam. If air power has not yet succeeded in tipping the scales in a war to which the Americans have committed 300,000 troops, how on earth can it protect non-communist Asia all by itself?

The blunt truth is that this is now an academic argument. China has nominated Vietnam as a test-case for what it claims to be a new kind of war. It is a land war, fought by relatively small formations of very brave men who are prepared to persist for years with the tactics of ambush and terrorism until the other side's nerve cracks. Those who believe that this technique of "people's war" should be opposed, because its aim is to set up an unacceptable form of society, have little choice but to fight it on its own terms: that is, by a land war. It is not the "right war in the right place." Defensive wars seldom are. It is not the sort of war that the Americans will be able to bring themselves to fight time and time again in other parts of the world. But if it comes out right in Vietnam, it will with luck not have to be fought all over again elsewhere. If the dissident minority in South Vietnam fails to take power by force of arms, dissident minorities in other places will think twice before they believe in Lin Piao's tip that they are on to a winner.

But if the technique of "people's war" does succeed in Vietnam, the past week's events in Peking will take on a new light. Those who do not like the war in Vietnam, but equally do not want to see Mao Tse-tung's beliefs sweeping across Asia in a wave of guerrilla wars, have a duty to ask themselves where else they think the wave can be stopped. Thailand? But the non-communist Thais are not going to call for help from a defeated American army, and in any case it is logistically much harder to get help into Thailand than into Vietnam. Burma? Not on the cards. India, then? But the mind swerves away from the difficulty of doing anything to help that fragile country if the

guerrillas once get to work in West Bengal or Kerala or wherever.

The fighting in Vietnam, it is said, could grow into the third world war. In a sense, it already is the third world war. It is not by the Americans' choice that this has become a testing-ground for the theories of Mao tse-tung and Lin Piao. It need not have been. If there were any reasonable grounds for thinking that a communist victory in Vietnam would not be followed by communist bids for power in the rest of Asia—starting in Thailand, and moving from there towards India—it would not be necessary to make a stand in Vietnam. It would not be necessary if Lin Piao had not written what he has written, and had not now been given Mao's accolade for writing it. It would not be necessary if Russia were able to assert its authority over the communists of south-east Asia and guarantee that a stable truce line, like the line between the two parts of Germany, could be drawn along the Mekong between a communist Indochina and a non-communist Thailand. If either of those things applied, a deal could be done in Vietnam tomorrow. The only losers would be those South Vietnamese, Buddhists and Catholics alike, who keep on telling anyone who will listen that they do not want to be ruled by communists. It would be a cynical deal; but it could be struck.

The deal the Americans cannot reasonably be asked to strike is one that threatens to sell the pass to the whole of southern Asia. This is Mr. Johnson's enormous problem. It is also the problem of those who criticise his decision to take America into the war. Those of them—an increasing number—who agree that America has a responsibility towards the non-communist nations of Asia cannot dodge the question it poses. How else can you suggest holding the line, if not by fighting in Vietnam?

## THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

### AMENDMENT—CHILD LABOR IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit for printing an amendment to H.R. 13712, the minimum wage bill, to provide for restrictions on child labor in agriculture. This amendment would provide the full protection to which our children are entitled, and would conform the bill to the provisions which the Senate previously adopted in 1961 and again in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 759) is as follows:

On page 43, strike out lines 14 through 17 and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

"(c) (1) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply to any employee employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, if such employee—

"(A) is employed by his parents, or by a person standing in the place of his parent, on a farm owned or operated by such parent or person, or on a neighboring farm, as defined by the Secretary of Labor, or

"(B) is fourteen years of age or over, or

"(C) is twelve years of age or over and is employed on a farm to which he commutes daily within twenty-five miles of his permanent residence, and (1) such employment is with the written consent of his parent or person standing in place of his



parent, or (ii) his parent or person standing in place of his parent is also employed on the same farm. The Secretary may by regulation prescribe maximum working hours and other conditions for the protection of the health and safety of children employed pursuant to this subparagraph (C)."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the supplemental views, which I filed today and which were joined in by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and are a part of the committee report on the minimum wage bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so that they will be available for overnight reading, and Senators may understand the background and reasons for the amendment I have just proposed.

There being no objection, the supplemental views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. JAVITS AND MR. WILLIAMS

CHILD LABOR IN AGRICULTURE

A. The problem

Almost two generations ago, this nation finally outlawed a practice which had become a national scandal—industrial child labor. If anyone in this body has forgotten the practices which, at the turn of the century, built whole industries upon the endless toil of children not yet even in their teens, let him examine the following transcript of the testimony of 8-year-old Helen Susscak answering Pennsylvania Judge Gray's questions about her job in a textile mill in 1911:

"Judge: Helen, what time do you go to work?"

"Helen: Half after 6 evenin's."

"Judge: When do you come home from the mill?"

"Helen: Half after 6 mornin's."

"Judge: How far do you live from the mill?"

"Helen: I don't know. I guess it mostly takes an hour to git there."

"Judge: And the Inspector tells me it's across lonely fields exposed to storms that sweep down the valley. What's your pay, Helen?"

"Helen: I gits 3 cents an hour, sir."

"Judge: If my arithmetic is good that is almost 36 cents for a night's work. Well, now, we do indeed find the flesh and blood of little children coined into money."<sup>1</sup>

But what we condemned with indignation over a generation ago in the textile mills and industrial plants of this nation we continue to accept in an often equally oppressive form—agricultural child labor. There are the same long hours, the same negligible pay, the same backbreaking work, the same exposure to the elements, the lack of educational opportunity despite the nominal restrictions on working "during school hours"—all the same practices which deprive the child of a real childhood.

Recent hearings by the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee revealed case after case of children employed under circumstances closely resembling the textile mill conditions we outlawed so long ago.

For example, the following is the report of Miss Stockburger, chairman of the National Child Labor Committee, testifying in 1963 about her most recent trip to a migrant area:

"When Don came to the school at 1 p.m., he had already worked in the fields from about 4:30 a.m. to 12:30. I asked how many beans he had picked. He replied, '\$6 worth—that's 300 pounds.' Then my comment was,

'Then you must be hungry. Come on, let's go eat lunch.' Don looked up at me and answered, 'Yes'm, I reckon as how I am. I ain't had no breakfast yet.'

"Then there was the 9-year-old girl who was found one hot July afternoon in a cabin ironing. In the course of the conversation she told of having been in the field all morning. When asked how she liked to work in the field she paused in her slow and deliberate strokes with the iron and with great vehemence said, 'I hate it. I hate to pick beans. But I gotta earn my livin.'"

"How vividly I recall our dismay when a young mother of five children, all under 6, with whom we had worked for several years brought only her three youngest to the day care center. When asked about the two oldest boys who were 5 and 6, her answer was, 'Oh, Billy and Johnny, I won't be leaving them with you this year. They're old enough to pick.'"<sup>2</sup>

In a few areas of the country, child labor has become almost a way of life. To cite one example, in the Willamette and Tuatation Valleys and the Hood River area in the heart of Oregon's strawberry area, in 1962 at the peak of the strawberry harvest season there were 66,610 workers employed—and of these, 65% (43,339) were under the age of 14, and 19% (12,000) were under the age of 12.<sup>3</sup>

But the problem is much more widespread—and infinitely more severe—throughout the areas of the country which employ migrant farm labor. Too often, farm communities make no provision for child day-care centers. They need not bother, for the children are all in the fields—all day long—working alongside their parents. Often the permanent residents of such communities are only faintly aware that these children even exist at all.

B. The proposal

The proposal<sup>4</sup> considered by the Committee would (1) prohibit the employment of children in agriculture under the age of 12, except on their family farm or a neighboring farm; (2) bar agricultural employment of children between 12 and 14 except on farms within commuting distance of home, and then only with parental consent; and (3) permit the Secretary of Labor to prohibit children under 16 from working at "particularly hazardous" jobs in agriculture.

The Committee accepted the "particularly hazardous" restriction (3), but, by a narrow margin, rejected the other provisions of the proposal.

In short, the Committee's majority is willing to permit any kind of child labor in agriculture—no matter how long the hours, no matter how arduous the work, and no matter how young the child—as long as it is not "particularly hazardous." This decision, grounded in the view that there is a sharp difference between conditions in industry and agriculture, will, unless reversed by the Senate, could, I feel, seriously prejudice many impoverished, undereducated and forgotten children in escaping from an indefinite continuation of their deplorable condition.

C. The controversy

Many Senators are already only too well aware of the crying need to extend child labor laws to agriculture, for the Senate has twice already—in 1961<sup>5</sup> and 1963<sup>6</sup>—passed substantially the same measure which the

Committee by a narrow margin this time rejected. But for those who may not recall or may have missed the debates a few years ago, the following brief resume of the arguments may prove enlightening.

We have been told—and no doubt will be told again this year—that the toil of children in the fields is somehow different from the sweat and strain of children in the textile mills—that it is somehow cleaner, somehow more fun, less dangerous, and really educational—or at least "healthy". The opponents of child labor laws will say this even though the cold facts are that agriculture is the third most dangerous of all our nation's industries, exceeded only by mining and construction in the rate of death caused by on-the-job accidents.<sup>7</sup> There is a restriction here against "particularly hazardous" occupations for children under 16, but have we the right to make that our standard for young children? The evidence strongly supports the conclusion that much more comprehensive protection is needed.

Nor can it be said that we are dealing with a few middle-class children gambling in the fields, eating strawberries as they go, perhaps to pick up a few dollars for a 4th of July week-end at the beach.

On the contrary, the child we seek to protect is among the most oppressed and deprived of our citizens—the child of a Mexican-American family living far below the poverty level, whose parents, for the lack of a permanent residence, cannot even vote and therefore exert no political influence, whose parents have no legal right to collective bargaining. In sum, this is a child who desperately needs to be brought in from the fields and made a part of the society which the rest of our children take for granted.

But we have been told—as no doubt the opponents of this amendment will tell us again—that federal law already prohibits child labor during school hours and therefore necessarily protects the educational opportunities of farm children. That is simply not the case. A combination of factors, including loose enforcement, particularly as to migrants, plus such practices as "crop vacations,"<sup>8</sup> has resulted in a very substantial impairment of farm worker education.

Secretary Wirtz, testifying before the Migratory Labor Subcommittee last year, reported:

"The degree of difficulty in this situation is, even under the school regulations which we have, investigations which have been made by the Wage and Hour Divisions of the Department of Labor last year covering 2,562 farms disclosed that 7,972 minors under 16 illegally were employed during school hours."

"Twenty percent of that group, 1,578, were 9 years or younger. More than half, over 4,000, were 10 to 13 years of age."<sup>9</sup>

D. A growing consensus in support of the amendment

The fact of the matter is that a substantial segment of our agricultural economy—including organizations representing the growers themselves—has endorsed a child labor law for agriculture. The Vegetable Growers Association of America has called

<sup>1</sup> Hearings Before the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., 32 (1963).

<sup>2</sup> Id. at 31.

<sup>3</sup> Hearings Before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, 89th Cong., 1st Sess. 37 (1965). "In one area, local children were enrolled in school, but enrollment of migrants was postponed for 3 weeks so they could harvest cucumbers. Still another State issued special permits to economically deprived children, those who needed education above all else, excusing them from school to pick fruit." Id. at 61.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Labor, "Growth of Labor Law in the United States" 1 (1962).

<sup>5</sup> Hearings Before the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., 104-105 (1963).

<sup>6</sup> Special Survey, U.S. Department of Labor (1962).

<sup>7</sup> Amendment No. 606 to H.R. 13712, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. (1966).

<sup>8</sup> S. 1123, 87th Cong., 1st Sess. (1961).

<sup>9</sup> S. 523, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. (1963).

this proposal "a very good bill."<sup>10</sup> The National Council of Agricultural Employers, representing members in 35 States, including individual growers, farm and commodity organizations, and employer associations, has said that "it has no objection to this bill."<sup>11</sup> In addition, of course, those citizens' organizations most closely concerned with the problem have endorsed this proposal in much stronger terms. The National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor endorses this proposal as a "keystone in the war against poverty,"<sup>12</sup> the National Consumers League has described this measure as "long overdue,"<sup>13</sup> and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives supports this measure as essential to the protection of the health of farm children.<sup>14</sup>

This proposal is nothing new. The Senate has passed this bill before in even stronger form.

We ought not to look away now from the exploitation of children in agriculture—with all its destructive effects—at the very time when we propose to extend federal minimum wage protection to other deprived groups in our society.

Can it really be said that these children need protection less than garage mechanics, bus drivers, or retail salesmen?

Can it really be said that 10-year-old children working for hours in the fields harvesting the food we eat are any the less exploited than children were 50 years ago manufacturing the clothes we wore?

The limitation on "particularly hazardous" occupations for child labor in agriculture, adopted by the Committee, is a step in the right direction. But the evil in the sweatshops, textile mills and other industries based on child labor in the last century was not just that they included certain "particularly hazardous" occupations, but that strenuous physical labor, on a regular full-time basis, was found to be *inherently* oppressive for young children.

In agriculture, as in industry long ago, it is the same old practice—perhaps less noticed, but just as harmful—and it ought to be stopped.

JACOB K. JAVITS,  
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

#### AMENDMENT—STUDY OF EMERGENCY STRIKE LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when the Senate considered the joint resolution on the airliner strike—Senate Joint Resolution 186—I sponsored an amendment, which the Senate adopted, to require the Secretary of Labor to study the emergency labor dispute provisions of our labor laws and to give us recommendations for improvements.

Senators will recall that the President promised in his state of the Union message to make such recommendations, but they have not been forthcoming. As this bill will very likely be the last labor bill this year, and as the airline joint resolution now has become moot, I intend to propose that the same amendment be added to the minimum wage bill.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I submit for printing an amendment to H.R. 13712, and ask that its text also be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection,

the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 760) is as follows:

On page 69, line 7, insert the following:

#### "TITLE VIII—STUDY OF EMERGENCY STRIKE LAWS

"SEC. 801. The Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act. The Secretary is further instructed to report to the Congress by January 15, 1967, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1487) PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably the bill H.R. 13712, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes. The bill contains an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I submit a report thereon and ask unanimous consent to file individual and supplemental views until midnight, August 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has an order been issued for the convening of the Senate on tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. An order has been entered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I move, under the previous order, that the Senate do adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 24, 1966, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

The following nominations were received by the Senate August 23, 1966:

##### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Miles S. McKee, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, vice Dr. N. R. Daniellian.

##### POSTMASTER GENERAL

Leo S. Packer, of New York, to be an Assistant Postmaster General (new position).

##### INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 3 years and until his successor has been appointed.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The Lord is my shepherd.—Psalm 23: 1.*

O God, whose strength sustains us in our work, whose hand supports us in our weariness, and whose presence gives us security in the time of trouble, grant unto us the renewing power of Thy holy spirit as we wait upon Thee in prayer. Lead us into green pastures, beside still waters, and along paths of righteousness in which our souls are restored. When we walk through the valley of the shadow of death, may we feel Thy presence near and in the assurance of Thy love find deliverance in the midst of our distresses.

Fill our hearts with such a faith in Thee, that by night and by day, at all times and in all seasons we may commit ourselves and those near and dear to us to Thy never-failing compassion and to Thy never-faltering mercy. Thus, may Thy goodness and Thy mercy follow us all the days of our lives, and in spirit may we dwell in Thy house forevermore. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13448. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to mailing

<sup>10</sup> Id. at 231. (See also id. at 130—National Apple Institute).

<sup>11</sup> Id. at 139.

<sup>12</sup> Id. at 199.

<sup>13</sup> Id. at 217.

<sup>14</sup> Id. at 145-146.